DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 825 IR 016 105

TITLE	Hearings on Reauthorization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). Hearings before the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundred Second Congress, Second Session (March 17-18, 1992).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-16-039193-8
PUB DATE	Mar 92
NOTE	169p.; Serial No. 102-114.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Delivery Systems; Early Childhood Education; Educational Finance; Educational Improvement; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Government; *Federal Legislation; *Financial Support; *Government Role; Hearings; Higher Education; Information Dissemination; Research and Development; *Research Needs; Research Utilization
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 102nd; ERIC; *Office of Educational Research and Improvement; *Reauthorization Legislation

ABSTRACT

At the core of a world-class system of delivery of educational services, there must be a comprehensive process for continual transmission of the best that knowledge synthesis and new experimentation can offer for utilization procedures and practices. This idea was expressed by Representative Major R. Owens, committee chairman, in his opening remarks at a congressional hearing on the reauthorization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). Statements from the following persons representing OERI and various facets of the educational community including research and development, testing, and educational technology, indicate the shape that various interests would like the reauthorizing legislation to take: (1) Diane Ravitch; (2) Thomas Schultz; (3) Edward P. Keller; (4) Wornie L. Reed; (5) Michael Webb; (6) Michael B. Eisenberg; (7) Linda Morra; (8) Stanley D. Zenor; (9) Arthur E. Wise; (10) Robert L. Linn; (11) Preston Kronkosky; and (12) Ann Lieberman. Prepared statements follow from each of these individuals, accompanied by letters and supplemental materials. The various panelists expressed concerns about the purposes and fundings of the OERI, as well as its funding. Information dissemination is a major concern. (SLD)

ED358825

HEARINGS ON REAUTHORIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT (OERI)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SECOND CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 17 AND 18, 1992

Serial No. 102-114

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
58-581 WASHINGTON : 1992

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-039193-8

58-581 O - 92 - 1

IR016105

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
CRAIG A. WASHINGTON, Texas
JOSÉ E. SERRANO, New York
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, Louisiana
JOHN F. REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
JOHN W. OLVER, Massachusetts
ED PASTOR, Arizona
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
BILL BARRETT, Nebraska
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
SCOTT L. KLUG, Wisconsin
MICKEY EDWARDS, Oklahoma
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California

PATRICIA F. RISSLER, *Staff Director*
JAY EAGEN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

MAJOR R. OWENS, New York, *Chairman*

DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
JOSÉ E. SERRANO, New York
WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, Louisiana
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
ED PASTOR, Arizona
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
(Ex Officio)

CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
SCOTT L. KLUG, Wisconsin
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearings held in Washington, DC:	
March 17, 1992	1
March 18, 1992	107
Statement of:	
Komoski, P. Kenneth, Executive Director, EPIE Institute, Hampton Bays, NY	107
Ravitch, Diane, Assistant Secretary, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education	4
Schultz, Thomas, Director of Early Childhood Services, National Association of State Boards of Education; Edward P. Keller, Deputy Executive Director, National Association of Elementary School Principals; and Wornie L. Reed, Director, Urban Child Research Center, Cleveland State University	77
Webb, Michael, Director of Education, National Urban League, New York, NY; Michael B. Eisenberg, Director, ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, and Chairperson, ERIC Executive Committee, Syracuse, NY; Linda Morra, Director for Education and Employment Issues, Human Services Division, General Accounting Office, Washington, DC; and Stanley D. Zenor, Executive Director, Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Washington, DC	131
Wise, Arthur E., President, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education; Robert L. Linn, Professor, University of Colorado, and Co-Director, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST); Preston Kronkosky, Executive Director, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, TX, appearing on behalf of the Council for Educational Development and Research; and Ann Lieberman, President, American Educational Research Association	29
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:	
Eisenberg, Dr. Michael B., Director, ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, and Chairperson, ERIC Executive Committee, Syracuse, NY, prepared statement of	137
Keller, Edward P., Deputy Executive Director, National Association of Elementary School Principals, prepared statement of	84
Komoski, P. Kenneth, Executive Director, EPIE Institute, Hampton Bays, NY, prepared statement of	112
Kronkosky, Preston, Executive Director, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, TX, appearing on behalf of the Council for Educational Development and Research, prepared statement of	57
Lieberman, Ann, President, American Educational Research Association, prepared statement of	69
Linn, Dr. Robert L., Professor, University of Colorado, and Co-Director, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST), prepared statement of	46
Morra, Linda, Director for Education and Employment Issues, Human Services Division, General Accounting Office, Washington, DC, prepared statement of	146
Owens, Hon. Major R., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York:	
March 17, prepared statement of	3
March 18, letter of response by	128
Chart supplied by	130

Page

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera—Continued
Ravitch, Dr. Diane, Assistant Secretary, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, prepared statement of 8
Reed, Dr. Wornie L., Director, Urban Child Research Center, Cleveland State University, prepared statement of 89
Schultz, Dr. Thomas, Director of Early Childhood Services, National Association of State Boards of Education, prepared statement of 80
Additional material supplied for the record 106
Webb, Dr. Michael, Director of Education, National Urban League, New York, NY, prepared statement of 132
Wise, Arthur E., President, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, prepared statement of 33
Zenor, Stanley D., Executive Director, Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Washington, DC, prepared statement of 155

HEARING ON REAUTHORIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT (OERI)

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1992

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:37 a.m., Room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Major R. Owens, Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Representatives Owens and Ballenger.

Staff present: Maria Cuprill, Laurence Peters, Theda Zawaiza, Wanser Green, Sylvia Hacaj, Braden Goetz, Robert Macdonald, Sally Lovejoy, and Andy Hartman.

Chairman OWENS. The hearing of the Subcommittee on Select Education will come to order.

This reauthorization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement which we are considering today seeks to take a significant and critical step forward toward the creation of a world-class research and development system. The United States of America is the only remaining world superpower. Education in America must first be education for world leadership. It must also be education for ever-increasing productivity to meet world competition. It must also be education to develop skills, habits and attitudes which allow the world's most diverse population to live together in law, order, peace and social harmony. These are the ultimate aims and ends of education in America. This is the summary of the mission of education in America.

Six goals have been set forth as the first step toward the realization of this mission. The administration has proposed world-class standards for each of these goals. The administration has proposed world-class tests to measure the achievement of our students with respect to each of the goals. Although the administration has not yet offered a plan for it, it is vitally necessary that we develop a world-class delivery system with world-class schools and other world-class educational institutions.

At the core of such a world-class delivery system there must be a world-class research and development system, a comprehensive process for the continual transmission of the best that knowledge synthesis and new experimentation can offer into procedures and practices for utilization. Research and development must be the locomotive which pulls and guides educational improvement in

America. The engine, at the heart of this vital and monumental effort, must be the Federal government. The engine of the educational research and development locomotive must be the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

There are clearly many educational research and development roles which must be assumed by the private sector and by State education departments and local education agencies. But the enormity and complexity of this task is such that only the Federal Government has the necessary resources to sustain it. For the sake of our students at every level, for the sake of our society and civilization and our exceptional standard of living, for the sake of our national greatness and national security, our Federal Government must not hesitate or equivocate. The Federal Government must fully accept this responsibility for leadership in the effort to continually improve our schools through research, development and dissemination.

We are a Nation of more than 250 million people, with more than 15,000 school districts, more than 3,000 colleges and universities, and more than 50 million students attending some kind of educational institution from preschool to continuing education. Our vast national education enterprise expends more than $360 billion. This enterprise, this Herculean effort, is already unparalleled anywhere in the world. This unique undertaking requires—indeed, it cannot survive and improve without it—this overwhelming effort to educate a Nation requires a world-class research and development system.

More than a century ago we acted with vision to develop the land grant colleges, experimental stations and county agents—a world-class research and development system for agricultural improvement. We later developed the National Institutes of Health, a world-class research and development system for health care. Following World War II we launched the expansion of a world-class military research and development system which ultimately made world war unthinkable. When we consider the fact that research and development has been so overwhelmingly successful in these modern American efforts, why do we hesitate to structure a world-class research and development system for the improvement of education?

Today, we are considering H.R. 4014, which represents a moderate leap forward, a foundation for the expansion of the present inadequate system into a construct worthy of the task before us. Incremental changes and tinkering at the edges are not permitted here. We offer the framework for a system, a vehicle for a process, which is flexible and adaptable but undergirded with enough resources to achieve desirable impacts.

Today's hearing is the continuation of a consensus-seeking process. America needs a nonpartisan or a bipartisan approach to the improvement of education. H.R. 4014 contains new ideas and complex concepts. Productive dialogue and debate will be necessary to reach consensus. Today, with the appearance of the administration's most authoritative representative, we escalate the level and intensity of our discussion. For the sake of education in this Nation, let us go forward to a productive conclusion.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Major R. Owens follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. MAJOR R. OWENS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

This reauthorization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement which we are considering today seeks to take a significant and critical step forward toward the creation of a world-class research and development system. The United States of America is the only remaining world superpower. Education in America must first be education for world leadership. It must also be education for ever-increasing productivity to meet world competition. It must also be education to develop skills, habits and attitudes which allow the world's most diverse population to live together in law, order, peace and social harmony. These are the ultimate aims and ends of education in America. This is the summary of the mission of education in America.

Six goals have been set forth as the first step toward the realization of this mission. The administration has proposed world-class standards for each of these goals. The administration has proposed world-class tests to measure the achievement of our students with respect to each of the goals. Although the administration has not yet offered a plan for it, it is vitally necessary that we develop a world-class delivery system with world-class schools and other world-class educational institutions.

At the core of such a world-class delivery system there must be a world-class research and development system, a comprehensive process for the continual transmission of the best that knowledge synthesis and new experimentation can offer into procedures and practices for utilization. Research and development must be the locomotive which pulls and guides educational improvement in America. The engine, at the heart of this vital and monumental effort, must be the Federal Government. The engine of the educational research and development locomotive must be the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

There are clearly many educational research and development roles which must be assumed by the private sector and by State education departments and local education agencies. But the enormity and complexity of this task is such that only the Federal Government has the necessary resources to sustain it. For the sake of our students at every level, for the sake of our society and civilization and our exceptional standard of living, for the sake of our national greatness and national security, our Federal Government must not hesitate or equivocate. The Federal Government must fully accept this responsibility for leadership in the effort to continually improve our schools through research, development and dissemination.

We are a Nation of more than 250 million people, with more than 15,000 school districts, more than 3,000 colleges and universities, and more than 50 million students attending some kind of educational institution from preschool to continuing education. Our vast national education enterprise expends more than $360 billion. This enterprise, this Herculean effort, is already unparalleled anywhere in the world. This unique undertaking requires—indeed, it cannot survive and improve without it—this overwhelming effort to educate a Nation requires a world-class research and development system.

More than a century ago we acted with vision to develop the land grant colleges, experimental stations and county agents—a world-class research and development system for agricultural improvement. We later developed the National Institutes of Health, a world-class research and development system for health care. Following World War II we launched the expansion of a world-class military research and development system which ultimately made world war unthinkable. When we consider the fact that research and development has been so overwhelmingly successful in these modern American efforts, why do we hesitate to structure a world-class research and development system for the improvement of education?

Today, we are considering H.R. 4014, which represents a moderate leap forward, a foundation for the expansion of the present inadequate system into a construct worthy of the task before us. Incremental changes and tinkering at the edges are not permitted here. We offer the framework for a system, a vehicle for a process, which is flexible and adaptable but undergirded with enough resources to achieve desirable impacts.

Today's hearing is the continuation of a consensus-seeking process. America needs a nonpartisan or a bipartisan approach to the improvement of education. H.R. 4014 contains new ideas and complex concepts. Productive dialogue and debate will be necessary to reach consensus. Today, with the appearance of the administration's most authoritative representative, we escalate the level and intensity of our discussion. For the sake of education in this Nation, let us go forward to a productive conclusion.

I yield to Mr. Ballenger for an opening statement.

Mr. BALLENGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have an opening statement. I look forward to the witness and her testimony and appreciate it very much.

Thank you, sir.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

For the first time we are pleased to welcome Assistant Secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. We look forward to the continuation of a dialogue that really has already begun at various levels, and today's testimony, I think, will move us a great step along the way.

Welcome, Madam Secretary. You may begin.

STATEMENT OF DR. DIANE RAVITCH, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. RAVITCH. Thank you, Mr. Owens, Mr. Ballenger. I have appreciated the opportunity to meet with each of you separately, and also to meet with your staff.

As you know, I have been willing to come to meet with Senators, Congressmen, staff members, anyone who was willing to hear the argument on behalf of an improved system of educational R&D. I appreciate also the invitation to appear today. I have submitted a written statement, but I have a few things I would like to add to the written statement.

I would like to open first on a personal note. I have been an educational researcher for 25 years, and I think it's probably fair to say that I'm a card-carrying member of the AERA. The reason I say "I think" is that in these last 8 months my life has been so hectic that I may have allowed my membership to lapse because my mail goes to New York and I'm no longer living in New York.

I received my Ph.D. in the History of American Education in 1975, and in the years since then have spent my professional life studying and writing about the problems of American education. I had, in fact, been studying or writing about them long before I got a Ph.D., which is why I say I've been doing this for 25 years.

I took this job 8 months ago—I was confirmed to this position 8 months ago—because I wanted to do what I could to improve American education and to strengthen in particular the role of educational R&D in which I believe passionately. I am committed to OERI's mission of promoting both equity and excellence for all children.

Mr. Owens, I am particularly appreciative of your advocacy and support for educational research and development. Last week I spoke before the House Appropriations Committee and I told the committee that if any business spent as little on R&D as we do in education, that business would soon be bankrupt. In this current year, the R&D gets nine-tenths of one percent of the Department of Education's budget. We are seeking a monumental increase, something in the nature of a 50 percent increase in our budget, which would bring us up 1.28 percent of the Department's budget. It looks like a lot, but when you look at it in context of the overall spending in education, both for the Department and for the Nation, it really isn't all that much.

I believe strongly that we must invest in knowledge and we must invest in improvement. Having said that, I would like to say that I commend the priorities that you have established in the legislation that we're discussing today.

I do have some concerns about the legislation and I would like to share those with you as frankly and as candidly as I have whenever I've spoken with you or anyone else. It seems to be a flaw that people have pointed out to me. They say that I speak too bluntly and you're not supposed to act that way in Washington. Sir, I haven't been here very long and I haven't learned how to speak any way other than from the heart, and I guess I will continue doing it.

I would like to speak to the issue of politicization because this is something that has been brought to my attention time and again. At the time that I agreed to do this and take this job a year ago, I continued to read in the educational press that OERI was a politicized agency, so I approached the job with a certain amount of trepidation, not knowing what I would encounter.

Having heard these charges of politicization again and again, I have taken to asking people if they would give me examples of politicization. They always tell me something about what happened 10 years ago. I can't do anything about what happened 10 years ago, so I say to them, "Tell me about something that's happening right now that I can change." I'm still waiting for someone to give me an example.

Sir, I believe these charges to be untrue. Repeating them over and over does not make them true. They're a slander on the dedicated professionals in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. I would say that those who believe in the mission of educational R&D should cease and desist from saying these things because the people who work there have in most cases spent 10, 15, 20 and even 30 years promoting educational R&D. They believe in it. They're hard working people, they're good people, they're sincere people. I think it makes a very unpleasant environment for them to do their work.

So I'm still waiting for any concrete examples of any instance of politicization in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. I will happily make any changes necessary, but I have yet to get a single example that I can do anything about because, as I said, I can't help what happened in 1982.

Let me speak to my major concerns in the legislation. I am very concerned about the board that would manage this agency. I believe first of all that the board is too large. I think that the reason it's too large is because there's an effort to make this board representative of a variety of organizations. I personally feel that the board should be composed of distinguished individuals, people who have spent their life in educational research and in education practice, people who have distinguished themselves by their devotion to the education of all children.

I think it is wrong to make a board, for an agency such as this, composed of representatives of organizations. In this case it's particularly wrong because many of the organizations that are suggested in this legislation are organizations that receive funding from the agency. I think there is a clear conflict of interest to have

people on the board who are representing organizations that are funded by the board. I think even the very idea of having a board composed of organizational representatives is wrong.

No other Federal agency of which I am aware is composed of an organizational board—not the National Science Foundation, not the National Institutes of Health. Both of those agencies have an advisory board composed of people who have distinguished themselves by their work in the field.

Far from assuring independence for research, such a board would politicize the agency. We would have a board that was "log rolling" and we would have a board that was ridden with conflicts of interest, either unapparent but nonetheless real. So I feel this is simply a wrong way to compose a board and it would create untold problems.

I think the kinds of powers that have been allocated to the board are also a problem. The board would have all the same powers as the agency itself. The board would have the powers to give contracts, to award grants, to hold workshops, to hold conferences. This would lead to incessant conflict between the board and between the Assistant Secretary, and between the board and the staff. It would certainly lead to all kinds of confusion. Imagine coming to Washington to attend a workshop or a conference, and the question would naturally arise are you at the board's conference or are you at the agency's conference? Are you at the board's workshop or are you at the agency's workshop? I see no reason for this duplication of function. Certainly no business would have a board of trustees or board of directors that had all the same powers as the business or the agency itself.

I do believe that OERI should have a board. I think it should be a board of distinguished individuals who are knowledgeable about research, knowledgeable about practice, and dedicated to the mission of the agency.

In studying the legislation and in trying to understand the board, and trying to analyze my own objections to it, I called various people in the research field to ask them for their opinion. I spoke to two of my predecessors, both of whom served in the Carter administration—the only two Democratic predecessors who were Directors of the National Institute of Education—Patricia Graham, who was the Director of the National Institute of Education from 1977 to 1979, and T. Michael Timpane, who was the Director of the National Institute of Education from 1979 to 1981. Pat Graham is now the president of the Spencer Foundation, and Mike Timpane is now the president of Teachers College, Columbia University.

Both Dr. Graham and Dr. Timpane believe that this board, as presently constituted, would be a very serious problem. In fact, I think I can quote them. They both said that this board would cause operational chaos, that it would cause chaos in the agency, and that it would make it difficult to recruit energetic and talented people to manage an agency that had so many "masters." I think it would be difficult—In fact, I can say personally that I would find it very difficult to function with such a board, and I can't imagine how anyone else would.

I am also concerned—and this is a separate issue—with the matter of multiplying committees and commissions and advisory

committees within OERI. At present, OERI has an advisory board, which I believe will be replaced by the reauthorization process, and I hope it will be a board made up of, as I said, a number of 9 or 11 very distinguished individuals. But in addition to that board, we also have a board for the National Center for Education Statistics. We have a board for the first program, and we have the National Assessment Governing Board. So that's four boards already. I understand the Senate will offer a board for the Office of Technology which doesn't yet exist. That's five boards. In addition to those five boards, this legislation proposes standing committees for each of the five institutes.

We would, if all of this came to pass, have ten boards, committees, or board-like entities. I think to have ten committees or ten boards for an organization as small as this one, where we have at this point less than $250 million devoted to educational R&D, is overkill. I think the multiplicity of these boards and board-like entities is simply overwhelming for the organization. I think it will lead to more delays, more bureaucracy, more inefficiency, in addition to which it will be a very expensive drain on the agency's S&E budget. Each one of these boards, I've been told by staff members on the Senate side, cost about a million dollars. That million dollars comes out of money which ought to be going for the staff of the agency to do the agency's work. Instead, it will be going to pay for the staff of these four, five, six, ten different boards, with I think very little to show for it.

I wanted also to speak briefly to the dissemination proposals in the bill. My own view of dissemination is that I would hope we could in the future build on the strengths that we have within the agency, which in my view is thus far unrealized. We have, I think, a very strong dissemination system which has yet to be well-coordinated. We have dissemination that comes from our research centers; we have excellent dissemination coming from many of our ten regional laboratories; we have an outstanding national diffusion network; we have the ERIC system, which has become an international model for electronic dissemination; we have our Star Schools, which has made a good start in distance learning. I would like to see this system strengthened and built upon.

We have a proposal this year for an electronic dissemination system, which we call SMARTLINE, and we're beginning the development of distance learning which will build on and enhance what we have done in the Star Schools program.

I think we have a good system in place. I think we can make it work much more efficiently than creating a new system. My concern is that if we create a new system and leave our existing system uncoordinated, we will have two underfunded systems instead of one very strong one. I guess I work under the principle of economy and efficiency that suggests we should take the system we've got and make it work, rather than to develop a parallel system and leave the one without building on the existing one.

At any rate, those are my more or less spontaneous comments on this. As I said, I submitted testimony.

I wish to say, Mr. Owens, again that I'm grateful to you for the support you have given. I think that I, more than most people in this city and Nation, are aware of how slender the support for any

kind of educational R&D is, and I am well aware that you have become the champion of R&D. So I am very dependent on your goodwill and hope that we can work together. I hope we will continue talking about having a consensus process, where what emerges from the legislation will be a system and a structure that allows educational R&D to achieve the promise that it holds for American education. I certainly look forward to working with you, sir, in making that happen.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Diane Ravitch follows:]

STATEMENT OF DR. DIANE RAVITCH, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

I welcome this opportunity, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, to present the views of the administration on issues relating to the reauthorization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). For the reasons stated below, the administration opposes H.R. 4014 as currently drafted. In particular, we oppose the provisions dealing with the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board and the proposal for dissemination through the creation of District Education Agents. Other concerns will be dealt with in a bill report.

First let me say, this subcommittee and the administration are in agreement about the importance of the Federal role in education research and improvement. Education research can provide the road maps this Nation needs as it continues its efforts to provide excellence and equity in education for all. And that agreement means that we all want to ensure that this vital work is conducted in the most professional manner possible. To this end, OERI should have a strong and active advisory board. That Board should comprise the best minds available to assist the Secretary in planning the research and improvement program.

Both the subcommittee and the administration acknowledge similar objectives in this reauthorization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. The need for creating and sustaining a comprehensive, long-term agenda to guide the Federal investment in educational research is a goal which we all agree should be addressed in this reauthorization. Additionally, that agenda should identify funding priorities, establish criteria to determine the success of investments made to implement that agenda, and be subject to periodic review. The administration also recognizes and concurs with the subcommittee's efforts to expand the Federal Government's investment in research by varying the mix of funding mechanisms and recipients. The need to strengthen dissemination to inspire teaching and learning for all students is a common goal shared by the administration and the members of this subcommittee. However, we disagree on the methods of achieving these objectives, and we hope to convince the members of the subcommittee of the need to make the appropriate changes to H.R. 4014.

The National Education Research Policy and Priorities Board as proposed in H.R. 4014 has a number of strengths. I am pleased that the reports to be required would be done by the Secretary with advice from the Board and not by the Board itself. The Secretary is the one responsible and accountable for the administration of the Department; boards are advisory. There remain, however, disagreements on matters of principle about the composition and functioning of the proposed Board.

The proposed Board does not ensure that the advice needed will be available. In the first place, the proposed Board is too large. With 20 regular members and nine ex officio, non-voting members, the Board is unwieldy. There is no apparent reason for so large a Board other than to ensure that the membership of the Board reflects organizations or associations of constituents. Such a principle is not necessarily the correct one to apply in the case of an advisory board, especially for research work.

In the second place, the proposed Board will add a layer of bureaucracy that will make the work of OERI less efficient. No business is run by its board of directors, nor is any large government agency. The nature of this Board—its size and powers—will cause people to wonder who is in charge.

In the third place, the proposed Board, by its very composition, will be highly political, for its members will be representatives of interest groups, many of whose members are recipients of funding from this agency, and in some cases the organizations themselves are. Such a Board would politicize the agency at the highest levels. The potential for "log-rolling" and conflicts of interest are obvious. Groups and associations by definition represent distinct interests.

It is not the groups and associations *per se* that should be represented, but rather the best thinking that can be found. What is needed to help ensure the professional quality of OERI's work are individuals with experience in education research and individuals whose work is affected by that research. The various National Institutes of Health each have a board that is selected, not by virtue of membership in organizations, but on the basis of individual qualifications. By analogy, an advisory board for OERI should comprise individuals with proven expertise in education research, individuals who are practitioners and policymakers in education, and individuals who have demonstrated concern for the education of all children.

Of course, individuals also face real and possible conflicts of interest. Existing law requires individuals to identify any potential conflicts and to recuse themselves from any deliberations in which there is direct or apparent conflict of interest. However, if Board membership is based on a principle of organizational representation, there would be virtually no matter before the Board which did not raise potential conflict with the interests of such organization.

I also object to certain responsibilities assigned in H.R. 4014 to the Board that impinge on the Secretary's authority and accountability in managing the affairs of the Department. A well-constituted advisory Board for the whole of OERI should advise the Secretary on all matters affecting the conduct of OERI. The proposed Board would, however, be the sole source for nominations of candidates for heading the Institutes. The Secretary would be required to submit to the Board for approval proposed actions for any grants and contracts exceeding $500,000. Additionally, the Board would have the authority to sponsor conferences and workshops. Such authority hinders the latitude and discretion of the Secretary to carry out the long-term research agenda of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement and unduly interferes with the Secretary's responsibility and accountability.

In this regard, I note that one of the powers of the proposed Board is to establish standards for peer review. I believe it important that an advisory Board for OERI play a role in the development of such standards and that the Board regularly review the overall operations to see that they are in conformity with those standards. But that role should be advisory in order to preserve the important principle of Executive Branch responsibility and accountability. Accordingly, I urge that a strong role be established for the Board in so advising and reviewing for the Secretary the development and implementation of the highest professional standards for the conduct of the work in OERI.

I am also concerned about the proliferation of boards, or board-like entities, for virtually all functions in OERI. As I understand it, each proposed Institute will have such a "mini-board" constituted as a "standing committee" of the Board with additional members from outside the Board. What rationale can there be for such multiplication of entities? If all activities are directly overseen by a board whose sole purpose is to look at that activity, more time is likely to be spent dealing with that entity than in conducting the work for which the unit has been established.

Therefore, I urge that the Board be reduced in size to no more than 11, and that members be selected by the Secretary on the basis of expertise and proven achievement in education research, education practice and policy, and proven concern and involvement with education for all children.

Another serious concern is with the proposals for improving dissemination. The question of how best to address the improvement of OERI's dissemination activities has occupied me since coming to the agency last July. My answer is, basically, that we should build on the strengths of what we have and look for the ways that electronic technologies can be used to enhance our efforts.

With our Labs, ERIC, NDN, and Star Schools, we have the fundamental elements of a comprehensive and effective dissemination system. Over the past year, these programs, along with Centers have developed a cooperative program to ensure that the results from research programs and the experience in the field are widely shared with one another. An electronic network is being established to enhance this collaboration. While such a network increases our capacity to communicate among ourselves, we need now to focus on expanding our reach to the ultimate users of knowledge and information about education: teachers, parents, administrators, and policymakers.

We must also find ways to wed the strengths of each component to the strengths of the others. H.R. 4014 does not do this.

The plain fact is that with human networks, our reach will always be limited. The proposal in the House bill for District Education Agents suffers from this inherent limitation of direct human contact. As I understand the intent of the proposal for such agents and for learning grant institutions, their purpose is to address the

ds of some of the poorest districts in our country. That the Federal Government a role to play in assisting those most disadvantaged is unquestionable.

Although disadvantaged, such communities know best what their needs are. The hers, parents, and leaders of those communities are the ones to directly address problems, not outside experts. The District Education Agents and Learning t Institutions would create another layer of administration that would be unssary and counterproductive. The money would be better spent on enhancing d improving existing dissemination programs.

Modern technologies provide us new tools to carry out our work. By using such technologies, we respect local autonomy so vital in our national life and provide a way for the Federal Government to assist the disadvantaged.

Mr. Chairman, I have already had the opportunity to speak with both you and the ranking minority member about a proposal for SMARTLINE (Sources for Materials and Research about Teaching and Learning for the Improvement of Nationwide Education). We envision SMARTLINE as an electronic network linking people engaged in teaching and learning, wherever they are, to the best information and material on how real improvement can occur. Our plans call for the development of a "smart system," one that can take queries in ordinary language—e.g., "How do I help my student with division by fractions?"—and give back substantive answers, examples, and sample lessons.

SMARTLINE can be conceived of as a massive highway system that will provide first-class service for all schools and districts. As things stand now, rich districts are already "wiring up," building their own systems. We need a *national* system to provide broad and democratic access to information. Our vision of SMARTLINE is to provide access for all the kinds of reliable information and data needed to improve education.

Enhancing our work in dissemination by using modern communications technologies is, in my judgment, the best way to answer to the responsibility the Federal Government has for supporting States and communities in seeing that genuine educational opportunity is afforded *all* students. Focusing resources on solid research and new means of sharing knowledge and experience with the States and local communities is, I believe, a far more effective approach to aid disadvantaged communities than expending additional moneys for yet another layer of agents and institutions.

Although the bill would authorize $144.5 million for Section 405 activities in 1993 and the administration only requested $115 million, we strongly object to the bill's distribution of the authorized funds. Whereas we requested $23 million for dissemination activities, including ERIC, that would be authorized under Section 405C, the bill would authorize only $17 million. We requested $60 million for the variety of activities that would be authorized under Section 405B, but the bill would authorize only $36.5 million, which would include set-aides for the Board and a State-by-State poll.

The administration appreciates the attention that the subcommittee has given to the reauthorization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. I look forward to working with the members of this subcommittee to fashion the best bill possible.

I understand the Department of Justice is reviewing the bill and has constitutional concerns regarding the appointment and functions of the Board and the qualifications of entities that would be eligible for grants. They will submit a separate communication to the committee.

I welcome your questions.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Well, Madam Secretary, first I think we have a problem with just our reading of the bill, the language of the bill, and we need to spend more time clarifying what we mean. I can't find some of the same things you find in the bill.

We don't have a proposal that the board have the same powers as the staff, as the executive of the agency. That's not in there. I don't know where it is. Maybe you can show it to me if you can find it.

I also have a problem with comments from Dr. Graham and Dr. Timpane. I prepared a letter in response to their letter, where I said—quoting from the letter—"When you spoke with Laurence

Peters of my staff on the afternoon of Friday, March 13, 1992—" just last Friday "—you relayed some of your concerns but conceded that you had never actually read the text of H.R. 4014, the proposed reauthorization legislation, and were basing your remarks on a second-hand report of its content."

Given the short time since that conversation in your letter, as well as the fact that you make no specific references to the bill's language, I assume that you still have not had the opportunity to review H.R. 4014. So I would hope we first read the bill and forward copies of the bill to Dr. Timpane and Dr. Graham. We at least should start with an understanding of what is said in the actual language of the bill.

The second problem, of course, if there's a basic disagreement on the role of boards, the developmental approach to management, then we have to discuss that. If you have contempt for that kind of input, as you show when you say that you want to use all of the money to finance the people who do the agency's work, as if the boards would not do the agency's work. Every board means more inefficiency, you say. You can't see boards making agencies more efficient. We have just the opposite concern.

We have no problem with your call for distinguished individuals to be on the board. Those representative groups that we have as constituents—and we're all connected in this day and age, everybody in the education field, in one way or another. We don't want any inactive people. So, if they're active, they're going to be on some board somewhere which is receiving a Federal grant, or they may have a job which relates to a Federal grant, or if they don't have it now, they're looking forward to it in the future, or they've had it in the past. So we're all going to be connected. Our concern is that you create a board that will have as broad a representation as possible, so that there's checks and balances and you avoid having any one interest group predominate because they're all represented.

They should be represented by distinguished individuals. The language of the bill calls for these groups to nominate people. We can establish standards for those people nominated to make sure that they are distinguished individuals. But communication is what we're seeking. We want the groups to nominate a distinguished person—a scholar, researcher, whatever—that will communicate with them and they have a consistent point of view. So all these various viewpoints together will allow us to reach some kind of balanced consensus. The purpose is to seek constructive consensus and to do it effectively and efficiently. If they're not effective, they don't move forward.

The bill makes it clear that the Secretary can move forward. You or any future Assistant Secretary would not be hampered by a board who can't make decisions. If they don't arrive at conclusions, you can go forward.

Let me ask you one question before I go any further. Is the testimony you presented a representation of your personal viewpoint, or is it the administration's viewpoint?

Dr. RAVITCH. It's my viewpoint, sir, and it's also the administration's. Any testimony that I submit is cleared through the Office of Legislation, but it's mine initially.

hairman OWENS. Was it cleared through the Office of Manage-
it and Budget?
r. RAVITCH. I really don't know. I would assume so.
hairman OWENS. It was not cleared by the Office of Manage-
t and Budget?
r. RAVITCH. (conferring) Yes, it was. The testimony was written
ny office, sir.
Chairman OWENS. But it's cleared by the Office of Management
d Budget?
Dr. RAVITCH. Yes.
Chairman OWENS. It has to be approved by OMB.
Dr. RAVITCH. Yes, sir. I'm an officer of this administration.
Chairman OWENS. Which is the case of all Executive witnesses who come before us.
Dr. RAVITCH. That's correct, sir.
Chairman OWENS. H.R. 4014 proposes a policymaking board which will have specifically proscribed responsibilities and limited jurisdiction. It will operate openly with continual public scrutiny. On the other hand, the Office of Management and Budget seems to have infinite powers, unlimited jurisdiction, and operates in secret. It is like a policymaking body that everybody has to get approval from.

Who are the decison-makers at OMB? What are their qualifications? What data bases do these grand censors utilize when they approve or disapprove the actions of all officials of the Executive branch or government?

Are the directives of OMB issued only after careful studies have been conducted? Are their conclusions influenced by reviews or written comments from interested scholars and practitioners? Have these powerful persons, who grant or deny final approvals on testimony, made any site visits or held any hearings?

How far beyond matters of budget and management does OMB intrude? Does OMB dictate long-range planning, goals and priorities? Can OMB veto day-to-day operational decisions? Is there any written document which details the parameters of power for this giant, invisible octopus?

The OMB is required approval of the testimony of witnesses of the Executive branch is a graphic example of the involvement of the Office of the Assistant Secretary, like all of the others, with a policymaking body. But in this case, the Assistant Secretary is forced to acquiesce to a faceless set of decision-makers far removed from the jurisdiction over which they exercise great power.

In stark contrast to OMB, H.R. 4014 proposes a diverse, highly visible body of experts respected by their peers, with certified training, experience and other legitimate, recognized credentials. Is not such a highly visible public group desired over the OMB's polyglot collection of invisible MBA's, accountants, statisticians and whoever may be there?

Dr. RAVITCH. Sir, if I may respond to some of your comments, Dr. Graham and Dr. Timpane did read H.R. 4014 because, in speaking to probably a dozen people in the field, each of them asked me for a copy of the legislation and I sent them copies of your legislation, as I have to many other people. So I'm sure that they read it.

They're both scholars and they would not have commented without reading the legislation.

Chairman OWENS. I can only relate to you what Dr. Graham stated to my counsel.

Dr. RAVITCH. Okay. I know that she does have a copy of the legislation. I didn't see her read it, so I can't speak to that.

I would also like to say that I do not have contempt for boards. I have been on boards. I served on the board of the New York Public Library for several years with Dr. Gregorian. I served on the board of Encyclopedia Britannica, which is a far larger enterprise than the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. I have the greatest respect for the work of boards.

I do think, though, that in one of the smallest agencies in the Federal Government, having ten boards is a bit much, sir. I do believe that most of my time, as well as the time of many of the people who are in supervisory roles, would be spent going to board meetings. I don't think this is a good use of our time.

In terms of the composition of the board, I would like to have exactly what you describe, in terms of people who are distinguished, people who are recognized in their field, people who can bring their insight and their wisdom and their judgment to the work of the agency. I do not think they should be nominated by interest groups. I think this is a politicization of the agency. It's not done in NSF, it's not done in the National Institutes of Health. I have been unable to find a Federal agency whose board is composed of people who have been nominated by interest groups, and certainly not by interest groups who receive money.

I mean, taking the Chief State School Officers as a single example, which is one of the organizations that you would have nominating a representative, the Chief State School Officers has been the single award winner of all of the NAG-B contracts for the consensus process. There's an obvious conflict of interest to have them represented on the board. I could go down the list and almost every other group that you have suggested has a conflict of interest. I think this is a disastrous thing to do to a Federal agency, sir, if I may say so.

I would like to have exactly the same people you would like to have, and I would like to have them there as free agents, not having to report to the group that nominated them, not having to feel that they're there because they were nominated by a group but knowing they were selected solely because they're distinguished in their field. I mean, I'm a member of many of the same organizations that you put on that list, but I don't feel I'm there because of the organization.

As for OMB clearance, I would say I have never had a problem with OMB. I have never had my language changed by OMB. Sometimes suggestions have come back to me about numbers that I was not aware of, in which I looked more closely and said they were right. I have never been vetoed or censored by OMB. I have not found it to be an oppressive power but have found it to be a useful check.

As far as our budget goes, I requested an enormous increase in the funding for educational R&D, and you may have noticed that OERI this year has a request in for a 54 percent increase, the big-

gest increase, as far as I know, of any Federal agency in the entire government. So I'm not in a position to complain about OMB.

My own feeling is, if you come in with a strong case and you make it, you can persuade anybody. I'm hoping I can persuade you, sir. I don't know if I'm going to be able to.

Chairman OWENS. I wasn't attempting to evaluate OMB. I didn't say they were an oppressive power. They may or may not be. That's not what I said. I said they are an invisible power. We don't know what their credentials are, and they do have veto power over what you do and what you say.

Dr. RAVITCH. Right.

Chairman OWENS. You say you have served on boards, as most of us have. I have served on boards and would offer for the record that most of the boards I have served on have been too weak and too irrelevant. That's one of the problems with American institutions.

In the last position you held as an administrator—not the last time you served as a board member, but as an administrator—what was your relationship as chief executive with the policymaking body of the agency, corporation, center, "think tank", bureau or whatever? What was the budget of that agency and how many employees did the agency have? What percentage of these employees were scientists or academicians? Over what period of time, for how many years, did the mission of the agency extend? Who were the beneficiaries of the research products of the agency?

In other words, we are concerned about the scope and breadth and depth of the mission of OERI, and whereas it's a small agency in the Federal Government now, we are hoping it won't remain such a small agency. So we would like to have the benefit of more input.

What has been your past experience?

Dr. RAVITCH. Sir, I'm a scholar. I'm an educational researcher. I have had 25 years of experience in the field of education R&D. I have spent 25 years writing and studying about American education. I have not been an administrator. I have been part of a large institution. I have served on two boards, each of which was larger than OERI. Those institutions were larger.

Chairman OWENS. But you have never been an administrator?

Dr. RAVITCH. No, sir, I have not been. I have been a researcher and I think that qualifies——

Chairman OWENS. What is the largest number of employees you have supervised?

Dr. RAVITCH. I have never supervised employees. I have not been an administrator; I've been a scholar. I don't think that's a disgrace. I don't think it should be considered——

Chairman OWENS. Have you had jurisdiction over any budget?

Dr. RAVITCH. Yes, sir, I have. I ran an NEH project which has a budget of about $350,000, in which I personally supervised it. But I don't think that being a scholar should be held against me, sir. I think this is——

Chairman OWENS. I assure you it is not. I don't know why you imply that's being held against you.

Given the history, experience, and successes of the research and development operations of the Department of Agriculture, the Na-

tional Institutes of Health, and the Department of Defense, why do you refuse to accept the structures and procedures of these entities as models for OERI—not models we will adopt in detail and directly replicate? We're seeking to improve the process with inputs and developmental management.

I have a chart here that I would like to have someone pass to you, which is entitled "How Other Research and Development Entities Make Funding Decisions." It shows that in OERI, under H.R. 4014, we are proposing that the board determine certain things which are pretty consistent with what the board of the National Science Foundation does with respect to its decision-making via the chief executive, and the National Institutes of Health. In fact, the advisory council must approve all grants and contracts which exceed $50,000. We are proposing something like $500,000.

The New American Schools Development Corporation, which is not a part of the Government, has its board of directors making the final selection for proposals which are to be funded.

Why do you find the board powers so frightening in this situation when it is now a pattern for academic institutions and research institutions?

Dr. RAVITCH. Sir, every grant and contract that goes through OERI is submitted to a competitive process, to peer review and to review. The fact that it may be peer review at the Secretary's discretion may be what's in the law now, but, in fact, everything we do is peer-reviewed and competitively bid. Nothing goes out simply because the Secretary says put it out. We do have an unsolicited grants authority in the V program, and I have no problem with a board that has the power to set any kind of research standards you want to. I believe in the highest kind of research standards.

I want to get back to the point you made before you went into this, sir, which is the question of the composition of the board. Neither NSF, nor the National Institutes of Health, has a board that's nominated by interest groups. That's the point I want to get back to. I don't think you can find another government agency that has a board composed of interest group nominees.

Chairman OWENS. We're taking a creative step forward. They should take a look at the process.

Dr. RAVITCH. I think it's wrong, sir. It is a creative leap, but it's also a creative leap that no other government agency or any business corporation labors under.

Chairman OWENS. That's unfortunate, because we're having a lot of problems with business corporations and other complex entities.

We think that it's important as we try to structure OERI. It is the engine of the locomotive of the research and development effort to improve schools in America. It's very important that we take a look at what's happening all around us in terms of complex organizations like this.

Dr. RAVITCH. Sir, having a board that's loaded with conflicts of interest does not make it a better agency.

Chairman OWENS. There are numerous instances where nonprofit organizations have representative boards and they function very well. We want a balance of interests, checks and balances. We don't see it as conflicts. We see the important thing being checks

and balances which may arrive at a consensus, which represents the thinking of most of America.

Dr. RAVITCH. Sir, this is the wrong way to go.

Chairman OWENS. In the area of education, one of the problems we have, Madam Secretary, is that every adult American is an expert on education and will tell you, if you just ask them, what we need to do to improve our education system. They'll tell you. Everybody has opinions. It's a highly controversial situation. We need to move into a situation where we can reach as much consensus as possible. We need to maximize the input of the experts and the respect for the experts so that we will go forward without everybody being bogged down in their own opinions and approaches.

Dr. RAVITCH. Sir, you have——

Chairman OWENS. In order to do that, I think we ought to look toward doing things a little different with policy and decision-making reforms proposed in H.R. 4014, which I would recommend to a lot of other bodies.

The proposal for a National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board is the result of extensive, in-depth reviews, consultations and deliberations by the Subcommittee on Select Education. We have had 15 hearings, 92 witnesses, and this problem kept coming up again and again, including Diane Ravitch being quoted as having stated there is a need to take steps to improve the way decisions are made. This board proposal was structured after reviewing the history of OERI and its predecessor, the NIE. We analyzed the testimony from 15 hearings and we looked at critiques from many articles and studies, including the 1991 National Academy of Education study which was codirected by the present OERI Assistant Secretary.

It is important to note that the subcommittee has also been very much influenced by other national and international management examples which have discredited the——

Dr. RAVITCH. Could you, sir, offer me one of those examples?

Chairman OWENS. I will demonstrate that in a minute—which have discredited the closed circle, command and control style of management preferred by strong executives all over the world. I was once an executive of a large agency and I know how boards are a problem, a nuisance, and you would like to manage without any interference.

In the private sector, in commercial banks and savings and loan associations, which are traditionally run by weak boards and strong executives, we have witnessed a monumental debacle which will cost the American taxpayers no less than $500 billion.

We have witnessed the American automobile industry, run by celebrated tycoons who isolated themselves from their consumers and constructive critics; we have witnessed their blunders which resulted in great waste and the bleeding of valuable capital and resources while they lost their predominant share of the world's automobile market. Almighty General Motors has recently announced the loss of billions of dollars and a massive downsizing of the corporation, while it yields to the Japanese and other better managed foreign corporations which stress teamwork and joint decision-making.

In government, we have witnessed the collapse of the economy of one of the world's two giant superpowers. The government of the Soviet Union, under the dominance of its communist party, was the ultimate advocate for command and control in its decision-making. While its very successful scientific and academic enterprises stressed teamwork and peer review, the vital Soviet decisions concerning the economy and political power were made by lone executives who had contempt for committees and the developmental management process.

Command and control, rugged individualistic entrepreneurs, swashbuckling tycoons, ivory tower geniuses, acting without checks and balances, have proved to be disastrous within the context of ongoing complex institutions. The committee or the board can never replace the function of the executive, but it is unwise and not sound scientific reasoning to risk any great modern enterprise without the support of a pool of peers with some powers in the decision-making process.

OERI must become a great modern enterprise. Within the context of the Federal Government, a body such as the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board is vital to the survival of this great modern enterprise which we propose to develop. The history of NIE and OERI is there to teach all of us who are free to learn. We should learn from history. I'm sure you will agree with that as a history professor. H.R. 4014 offers a well-reasoned and sincere attempt to avoid the devastating mistakes of the past.

Command and control is obsolete. Developmental decision-making is clearly the way of the future and the only way to achieve lasting results in the complex, inevitably controversial arena of educational improvement.

I take the time to state this because we are talking about philosophy, a philosophy of management, a philosophy of decision-making. I think this is as good a place as any to take it on, because the Federal Government in general, the institutions in this Nation in general, need something different because they are blundering in very serious ways, wasting our resources, and a great Nation is in danger of becoming a second rate Nation if we don't begin to manage better.

Dr. RAVITCH. Sir, I don't know that OERI is the right place to change the management of the auto industry and the savings and loan industry, but I just want to say that I think you would be very surprised if you came and spend a day at the office to discover that we, in fact, do have a developmental decision-making model. There is no command and control process. In fact, I think you would be quite amazed to discover that the agency is very different from the picture that you've drawn of it.

We have a wonderful atmosphere there. The staff has a terrific spirit. People work together in a collegial atmosphere, of tremendous professionalism, and I don't really recognize the caricature that gets drawn in the statements that were written for you because it's not the agency that I know and it's not the agency that I've been working in every day for the past 8 months. What I see is a core of people who work very hard in something they believe in, who do a great deal of shared decision making, who work collaboratively, who work collegially.

Sir, first of all, you have to recognize that we are not an independent government agency. We are part of a cabinet. We are a part of the Department of Education, so we're not a stand alone agency. We're not the National Endowment for the Humanities, we're not the NIH, we're not the NSF. I have often in a sense compared us to the NSF, or said I would like to compare us to the NSF, for one reason. I would like people to believe that the degree of professionalism and the degree of expertise in OERI is equivalent to that found in NSF. What the education community lacks and the scientific community has is a large degree of consensus. So in order to truly have consensus, you would probably have to have a board of 200 or 300, and even there I doubt that we would get consensus. I wish that we had the consensus that the science community has, but we do not.

I would like to say, though, that if the NSF is to be a model, then look, sir, at the board of the NSF. Their board is not selected by science education organizations. It is not selected by science interest groups. These are individuals who were selected on the basis of their distinction and their achievements. That I believe is an appropriate board for the Office of Educational Research.

I do believe we should have an advisory board. I do not have contempt for advisory boards. I respect them. I think we should have access to the best minds in America. I think the work of the agency is very important and I would not like to see it in any way undermined by fighting between the board and the agency, fighting between the board and the Assistant Secretary. I know this has happened in the past in the agency and I don't think we should recreate some of the bad things that have happened in the past.

I think we should move forward and bring the best minds in the country to bear, to see how we can improve our R&D and all of our systems, to make them work better on behalf of all of our children.

Chairman OWENS. Madam Secretary, I have been in Congress for 10 years. I've been on the Education and Labor Committee for 10 years. I've been interested in education research and development for that entire 10 years. I have been observing OERI from the point of oversight responsibilities of Congress.

We hope that the kind of collegiality you talked about does exist and that there is a productive atmosphere. We have no problem with challenging that statement. But we have had 15 hearings and listened to 92 witnesses, and some of those people were former NIE and OERI officials. We have reached our conclusions as a result of a very painstaking, thorough process.

I don't think visiting your agency for one afternoon or for 1 week would make much difference. Whatever I see there I would have to weigh against the kind of data which we have gathered, from the comments that have been submitted by people who have read our bill, by the testimony, and by the ongoing information we receive from articles that have been written, as I said before, including your own criticism of the agency in the past.

Let me conclude this section—and I will come back after Mr. Ballenger has had an opportunity to ask some questions—by asking you what is your personal vision for OERI in the year 2000? How large should the central operation be here in Washington? Should OERI have regional branches? What should be the relation-

ship between OERI and the universities? Should we have more regional laboratories? Should we have more research centers?

These are questions that I have written. I will be happy to give you copies so that if you can't answer them fully here, you can answer them later. I will give you copies of the statements that I read before. I wrote those statements because I wanted to minimize confusion and make certain that I would be able to give you a copy of what I said, so that the dialogue can go forward with at least an understanding of what the two of us are saying, so that there is no confusion about the written word.

So would you give us your personal vision for OERI?

Dr. RAVITCH. Yes, sir. I would consider it a tremendous triumph if this year we could get our R&D budget up over one percent. I know Art Wise is going to be on the next panel, and when I first saw Art in Washington, he said "I feel sorry for you. The budget that you have now is the same budget that we had 20 years ago and it hasn't grown in constant dollars. You have far less money for R&D than we had 20 years ago."

Chairman OWENS. Fifteen percent less.

Dr. RAVITCH. I would like to see R&D much more substantially funded. I would like to see a much more significant investment in knowledge, as I said at the outset, and I would like to see an improved dissemination system. We have been engaging in the last several days, or longer, in looking ahead over the next 3 years, just for the next 3 years, so we haven't tried for the year 2000. But that would be a good exercise, too.

I would like to see a stronger investment in basic research in education. I would like to see an investment in our dissemination system such that the regional laboratories are better funded, such that NDN is much better funded. I would like to an expansion of NDN so that the NDN agents would become what you call the educational extension agents. I think they're on the ground, they know the schools, and they are well skilled and well versed in what they do. I would like to see, rather than creating a whole new set of agents, expansion of the NDN.

I would like to see our ERIC system expanded so that ERIC is serving not just graduate students and scholars but serving schools as well. I could see our system expanded to the point where the SMARTLINE system bring educational information into every home, every school, and every workplace, so that any student, any parent, any teacher, any administrator, could go to the SMARTLINE system and get whatever information they needed. I think we need a democratization of access to information.

I would say, beyond that, if I had my druthers, we would be wiring the whole country with fiber optics and bringing distance learning into everyone's home, everyone's school, and everyone's workplace, so that you could learn what you wanted, when you wanted, and where you wanted.

If I had the "magic wand," sir, we would have an educational R&D system unlike anything that you could imagine, but one which I can imagine. I had the pleasure last week when I was in California of being invited to lunch with George Lucas at "Skywalker Ranch." We talked in the Blue Sky territory about how electronic technology could transform learning.

We haven't even, at the Federal level, begun to envision what might be done. I had some vision of this and I felt somewhat sad at the fact that the Federal Government now is lagging far behind many States and localities in terms of developing electronic technologies.

I described last week to the Appropriations Committee a regional service center that I saw in Texas. It's not a Federal lab. It's a Texas regional lab. It's running eight cable stations just for its own region. It is providing access to resources about special education for all the teachers of the region. It's doing staff development for all of the school districts in its region. This is a terrific service that is provided that I think goes far beyond what the Federal Government has even contemplated.

So I could give you a grand vision, and I think it's one that would be transformative. It's also one that would be very expensive. But I think in order to get there, first of all, we have to stop the warfare that goes on between OERI and its critics. I have tried with the regional laboratories to reach out, to work with their representative in Washington. I visited three of the labs and I plan this week to be in a fourth lab. Whenever I travel, I try to visit a lab or a center. In every place I say to them, "I understand from talking to others that there is this traditional hostility between OERI and the labs and I think it's ridiculous. I think we should be working together to build a system together."

When I was at the Far West lab last week, the story that I told was of the scorpion and the fox, and I'll share it with you because it's so appropriate for the problem that OERI has had in the past and which I'm trying to overcome.

There are a scorpion and a fox both wanting to cross the Jordan River. The scorpion asked the fox if he can have a ride on the fox's head because the scorpion can't swim across and the fox can. The fox said, "If I let you get on my head, you'll sting me and I'll die." The scorpion said, "Well, that would be ridiculous. If you're swimming and I'm on your head, we'll both drown." So the fox said, "You're right about that. That's logical."

So they start swimming across the Jordan River with the scorpion on the fox's head. They get half-way across and the scorpion stings the fox. The fox, before dying, looks up and says, "How could you do that? We're going to drown." The scorpion says, "That's easy. It's the Middle East and we're all crazy here."

[Laughter.]

Well, we have been in a scorpion and fox relationship with the labs for a long time. They fought us and we fought them. I think it's stupid. I think it's self-defeating. I think we should see ourselves as part of the same system. I think the NDN has some reluctance to work with the labs because they're afraid of being swallowed up by the labs. I have advised them that they should overcome that reluctance and work with them.

I am trying to work with all the groups that are a part of this system and get them to cooperate and to collaborate. I'm trying to create an atmosphere in which people recognize that we have common goals, and that if we keep fighting each other, we will not only not reach any common goals, but we will destroy the ability of the agency to do anything constructive.

So what I'm doing I should say is trying to reach beyond partisanship and to create a nonpartisan professional agency. It's not a well-concealed fact—in fact, it's a fairly well-known fact—that I am a registered Democrat, that I came to this administration not for partisan reasons, not for political reasons, but because I have a deep faith in the importance of what the Federal Government can do and might do in educational R&D. I believe in that, and as long as I'm here I'm going to fight for that. I'm going to fight to protect what I see as the good work of the agency and fight to make that good work stronger, and try also to say when things are happening that I think are wrong, that I'm not controlled by OMB. I think that having a board composed of interest groups is bad for the agency, and I think we all have to have a vision of what education might become and how we might help it, and rise beyond the kinds of petty quarrels of the past 10 years and recognize this is not 1982, there are no cranks of any kind in the agency. We're trying to do a job and we would really love to have your support in making the good things happen.

Chairman OWENS. Madam Secretary, as you know, as a result of discussions we've had about SMARTLINE, we are very much on board with that concept and would like to see it fleshed out so that we can more clearly see where it's going.

One of our problems is that we have great fears here in Washington because there have been 11 Assistant Secretaries in 11 years at OERI. We have great fears when concepts are proposed and they're not fleshed out; when we don't see how they're begun, how they can be set forth in blue prints so that commitments are made for the middle and the end at the same time, so that we can clearly see where we're going and what kind of resources will have to be committed for that purpose.

I also want to thank you for the intelligence. I didn't know there was such hostility between the labs and OERI. We have not discerned that in the years that we have been involved with this process—that there was a great hostility. We didn't pick that up.

I yield to Mr. Ballenger for questions.

Mr. BALLENGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That was quite an exchange there. I thought it was a very intelligent discussion of differences of opinion.

My own opinion is, having served on many boards and then as an executive on many boards, I have found that boards themselves, generally speaking, are run by the strongest member of that board, whoever it may be, and whoever has the biggest axe to grind. But I do remember exactly one board that was appointed in North Carolina by the State legislature, the North Carolina Housing Foundation Board. Every year we used to fund $40 million worth of bonds that would fund up to $400 million worth of housing to build. On that board were very knowledgeable people, construction people of all things. I mean, real experts as far as the purpose of the board.

I did my best to get that board shut down completely because what happened, with all the experts there, every time a bid came up in their area, they would say "I'm going to excuse myself and I won't vote on this thing, but I'm going to be sitting next to you when it's your turn, so I won't vote on this one, but how about you

go ahead and vote—" and surprisingly, it was always the board member that got the bid to build the housing.

It is a real difficult thing when you have people that have a conflict of interest, an obvious conflict serving on these boards. I don't know whether there's anything in the bill saying that they should excuse themselves from voting on the issues, where I can see the NCEA or something like that, where the study would come out and you're trying to prove that teachers deserve more pay or some kind of thing like that, I can see problems.

I would say one thing more. OMB kind of decides what you all can do, but in reality, I think the Congressman knows that the Appropriations Committee decides what we can do in spite of whatever we may try to bring up here.

One thing I wanted to ask you. You're going to Gastonia, NC on Friday. I don't know whether you will have enough time or not, but if you want to see a fabulous operation that is the latest in fiber optics and so forth, they have connected up three colleges, two high schools, and two junior high schools, and they all have the same TV connection. I saw it in operation and it's beautiful. Generally speaking, the biggest high school or the biggest college has the teacher, and they're in front of a camera and they have a classroom in front of them, and they're teaching. But in the other smaller schools—they were at that time teaching fourth year Spanish. Well, you know as well as I do, small schools cannot afford to teach fourth year Spanish. But here was a teacher from a college teaching fourth year Spanish to two junior high schools that never could have had it, and they can talk back and forth. I can see photographing somebody and just sitting there and watching it, but the ability to have a discussion with the teacher, from any one of the classrooms—and it's put together by the school system there that I'm very proud of and I thank you kindly for going down and recognizing them at least by your attendance. But it's put together by the Bell system and the school system, and if you want to see communications in the ultimate, I hope you have time to at least ask them about it. I'm proud of it myself.

We have listed in here America 2000. But it's not the America 2000 that I think we started with, where we were going to let the development, as you said, come from the bottom up. Most of the brilliant ideas don't come out of Washington. In fact, I find very few brilliant ideas coming out of Washington. I'm glad you came to bring some. But generally speaking, as far as education is concerned, I see all the brilliant ideas coming out of the local school system. I think in the school systems that I know are somewhat like the county commissioners that I know and the city councils that I know, and the State legislatures that I know, and they say to Washington, "Please don't give us any more help. We can't afford what you give us. And besides that, it's 15 years late."

Pardon me for preaching, but I always wondered why in North Carolina our educational system, which is run with the help of the Federal Government at the State level, would always, 10 years after California had tried something and thrown it away, we would decide to do it in North Carolina. We never disseminated the fact that it failed in California, so it should not preclude the chance of failing in North Carolina. An absolute waste of money.

But we spent so much time on the board, I was wondering if there are any other areas of the bill that might bother you.

Dr. RAVITCH. Well, I did mention that I was concerned about the multiplication of boards, and that is that each of the institutes would have its own standing committee or advisory group. If that were to come to pass, as I said, I think we would have ten different advisory committees or boards or board-like entities in a very small agency.

I do have some differences about the recommendation for dissemination agents, in part because I don't think they will ever be adequately funded, and also mostly because I think we have a system that we ought to make work rather than create a new one.

Thirdly, because as you said, some of the best ideas are not coming from Washington. One of the great joys of being in this job is I've had the opportunity to out and travel around the country, and wherever I go I try and see a school. I ask people to show me what's going right. I have seen some fabulous schools. I was in Baltimore not too long ago and saw—I think maybe Mr. Owens has seen some of these schools—the Robert Slavin "Success for All" schools in Baltimore, where you see kids who in many other systems would be doomed to failure. In the Baltimore system they are doing reading, they're writing, they're learning science, working collaboratively with each other. Kids are getting one-to-one tutoring. They are very exciting schools that Robert Slavin has created, with Federal support for his research over a very long period of time.

I saw schools in Houston, one of which was an accelerated school based on a model that came out of Stanford University, Hank Levin's accelerated schools, where he says, when you have kids who are having problems, don't hold them back; accelerate them. Move them faster and treat them like gifted children. I saw a school that was 90 percent Hispanic where the kids were learning and using computers, reading, writing, math, bilingual, everything was in there. The kids were excited, the teachers were excited. I sat on the carpeted floor with the teachers for an hour talking about what they were doing, how they felt about it. I said, if there was one thing you could change in this school, what would it be? Half of them said, spontaneously, we would like to have year-round school, year-round school. These kids in the summertime they lose it. They go home to Central America and they don't come back until October, November or whenever, and we would like to have the school open all the time for them.

So I have seen some wonderful things going on around the country. Some of them have been stimulated by Federal research. Almost all of them that are really working are based on something we've learned from research. That's one of the reasons that I believe in research. I do think that when you see a good school, it's not just an accident. It's not just having one good teacher. It's having teachers who have had the opportunity to learn about good things that are happening somewhere else and to try to adapt it to their own special needs in their own neighborhood.

I wanted to say, while I have the chance, since Mr. Owens pointed out that there has been such a big turnover in Assistant Secretaries, I bought a house and I plan to be here for 5 more years. So I

hope that's some assurance to some people here. Maybe not everybody.

I also wanted to say, in terms of technology, OERI has taken the lead on technology for the Department. Our Star Schools program is very similar to what you described, Mr. Ballenger. I have seen the demonstration of what Star Schools does. It goes into something like 6,000 schools, and almost all the schools in the Star Schools program are schools that can't afford the physics teacher, can't afford to have Japanese taught. There are kids now in college who couldn't have gone to college except for what they got out of the Star Schools program because their own rural school didn't have a calculus course, didn't have an advanced biology course, didn't have the courses that they need.

They have given examples of where students now at MIT who but for Star Schools would not have been able to go to college at all. So I think this is a wonderful program and it's the kind of thing that I hope we'll be able to expand if there's a sufficient Federal commitment to technology.

Mr. BALLENGER. Thank you, ma'am. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Let's return for a few minutes to pick up on a few other points, Madam Secretary. On SMARTLINE, can you tell us how SMARTLINE will relate to ERIC or how it will relate to college and research libraries, to public libraries, and to the existing electronic data bases?

Dr. RAVITCH. Yes. The intention for SMARTLINE is that it will connect all existing data bases related to education, that we will be developing new data bases that synthesize research that's now in ERIC, so that when a parent asks a question, the parent will get a synthesis of the research. It might be no more than a page or a page and a half, written at an eighth grade level, that most parents would easily be able to understand. So that if a parent asked SMARTLINE a question about how to help their preschooler learn to read, a very simple language, concise, clear statement would come out of SMARTLINE.

If, on the other hand, a teacher or an administrator were to ask questions, they would get a much more detailed response, which might come directly from ERIC, or which might come from any number of other—we're expecting it to connect up dozens and scores of data bases so that SMARTLINE will actually be able to roam through the data bases and find exactly what the researcher or the teacher or the administrator is looking for.

I think what's important about SMARTLINE is not only would it go into every school and library in the country, but that it would provide a rapid entry into all of these data bases to collect whatever information was needed. But, more importantly, we would have to have—and we're planning for it—new data bases.

I think the most important example I could give you would be a data base of current Federal funding. Right now, if a school district wants to know how can I apply for Federal funding, they hire a consultant in Washington who reads the Federal Register and tells them. With SMARTLINE they will be able to go to the local school or library and ask in the data base what are the current RFP's and get an updated response so that they won't have to hire somebody

to tell them what really is public information and ought to be public information. So I see it having a tremendous value.

I would expect that our labs at NDN, the centers, and all of the different parts of the R&D system, would be part of SMARTLINE. For instance, if a parent or journalist might say "Where can I see a good demonstration of hands-on science teaching in the State of North Carolina", there might be 10 or 15 examples that would pop up. They might ask a question about what are other urban superintendents doing about dropouts, where there are effective dropout prevention programs. Examples would come up of not just the name but who do you get in contact with, who is evaluated, what evidence do you have for its effectiveness, and whatever follow-through information was necessary.

We did meet with the urban superintendents network. They are one of the focus groups that we've been working with to try to say what is it people want to know from this. The staff who is working on this has been meeting with a variety of groups, just to assess what is it people want to know, and whatever it is they want to know, that's what we intend to provide.

Chairman OWENS. You introduced the staff that was working on SMARTLINE, so I have met them. At that time I had asked questions about what other groups are going to be involved in the development of this very ambitious and very much needed educational product. Will you have some ongoing involvement of groups like the American Library Association and——

Dr. RAVITCH. Yes. They have met with different library representatives. I had a meeting when I first got here with about a dozen of the library leaders from different organizations and introduced them to the concept, and then introduced James Mitchell, whom you met, to some of those who were most interested. He has been working with them and consulting with them on a regular basis.

We had our associations meeting just last week, where we had maybe 50 or 60 people representing major associations, including library leaders. Interestingly enough, while we were presenting the whole budget of something like $450 million, the interest in SMARTLINE was overwhelming, to the point where I had to say, "Stop, isn't anyone interested in anything but SMARTLINE?" But, in fact, that's what people want to know. They want to know when are we going to join the 21st century, when is education going to be part of the technological revolution. Yes, we do intend to work with the libraries and we intend to work with the schools. We are really open to consulting with anybody who can help us, because we're looking on this as a collaborative effort. This is not OERI providing an answer to the world, but OERI asserting leadership.

Chairman OWENS. Are you structuring a group to help this process all along the way? There are a tremendous number of groups out there who can make contributions. Do you plan to somehow involve them on an ongoing basis, not just an ad hoc, episodic basis? Have you ever heard of the Educational Products Information Exchange?

Dr. RAVITCH. Yes.

Chairman OWENS. The Information Industry Association? Those are private sector people. There are a number of groups where it seems to me—and I know you don't like boards——

Dr. RAVITCH. We will have a board. I understand there's been a proposal on the Senate side to create a board for the Office of Technology. There will be a board, I believe.

Chairman OWENS. The Office of Technology board will have jurisdiction over SMARTLINE?

Dr. RAVITCH. I would think so. Right now there's no appropriations for Technology, so I'm not quite sure what the board will have jurisdiction over. But since we're trying to get some movement on technology, I would imagine it would incorporate both SMARTLINE and any planning for distance learning.

Chairman OWENS. Do you have a more fleshed-out written proposal for SMARTLINE at this point, with the budget——

Dr. RAVITCH. Yes, we have an RFP, which I believe will be ready within a matter of days, if not the next few weeks. We now have a contract to get projections on the cost of SMARTLINE. In the Appropriations Committee meeting, Congressman Obey asked me about the specifics on the budget. I was not at that time able to provide it. So we have hired a consulting firm which is going to give us as good an—I guess as fleshed-out an estimate as we can prepare. But we are working on that.

Chairman OWENS. You have an RFP for the total proposal, or just one——

Dr. RAVITCH. As you know, we had very restricted discretionary funds this year, and we had decided, because of the importance of this, to take a million dollars of our discretionary funds to launch the developmental process for SMARTLINE. Part of that developmental process is understanding fully what it's going to cost to build the system. But it also means that we will be able, at the end of this developmental process, to have some work stations up and running, as well as to begin experimentally the development of new data bases.

We are hoping in this next year, if we can satisfy the Congress that our budget estimates make sense, we hope that we'll be able to get the developmental money to really move ahead and develop the new data bases that people are very eager for. I think right now we don't have the data bases that people would really want to plunge into, at least not for parents. We certainly have them for scholars and to some extent for teachers, but I think that new data bases are needed, certainly in terms of, let's say, identifying best programs and best practices.

Chairman OWENS. Can you supply this subcommittee with your budget estimates?

Dr. RAVITCH. Absolutely. I'm delighted to do so, sir.

Chairman OWENS. You mentioned something about 1982, that the kind of thing that happened in 1982 couldn't happen again. What were you making reference to?

Dr. RAVITCH. Well, when I have asked people to give me examples of politicization, they say someone was appointed to this position or to this agency—I'm not quite sure whether it was a leadership role or some subordinate role—there were people appointed that were considered very political and who were not responsible. I

don't know who they were because, being a historian, I like to write history, but I know also that I'm not a time traveler and I can't go back and change what happened.

Chairman OWENS. In 1991, in your document, "Research and Renewal of Education," which you were co-director of, you stated "Patterns of support for research in education are episodic, buffeted by changing demands, vacillating leadership, unstable commitments, and institutional pressure."

Would you care to clarify what you meant by that?

Dr. RAVITCH. Well, I think it's very clear that if you look at the funding history of this agency, there has been a lack of support over time for a strong and growing role in R&D. I think that if you take each one of those statements that you just read, those are things that are caused by human beings and can be changed by human beings. So what I have done is to put my body on the line and say I'm going to change that. I'm here to provide stability, to fight for long-term funding, to establish the credibility and the value of educational R&D, and to provide leadership and a sense of vision.

What I can't give the agency is the tough management, so I was very fortunate in finding a tough manager to come in with me. The Deputy Assistant Secretary was the associate superintendent for the State of California, where she did run a major agency with $150 million or so of budget expenses under her. She's a tough manager. I provide leadership and vision and I think we have a good team. I think what you will see in results will justify whatever faith I hope to evoke in you.

Chairman OWENS. I wish we could go on but we have a time problem and we're going to have to conclude in a minute. But I would like to comment on the statement you made about the learning grant institutions and district education agents.

First of all, in your testimony you referred to them strictly as an operation to service the disadvantaged communities. I want to clear that problem up right away.

At the outset, it should be made clear that the learning grant institutions and district education agents proposed in H.R. 4014 are not just for the poorest congressional districts in the Nation. H.R. 4014 proposes this technical assistance and delivery system for all of the 435 congressional districts, since schools all over America are in need of improvement. To meet world class-standards, even the very best schools should be improved. In H.R. 4014, we propose to begin this system by launching the first 50 programs in the 50 poorest congressional districts. But what is learned there will be applied throughout the Nation.

Eventually, like the network of land grant colleges, experimental agricultural stations and county agents, this system will support educational improvement efforts throughout the Nation. Mr. Ballenger made reference to the fact that educational research in his State often is way behind, and that something they have already discarded in California is introduced in North Carolina. The history of the land grant colleges, experimental stations and county agents did not follow that pattern. If they had not been effective, agriculture in America would not be the unchallenged leader of the world. The one place where we still don't have any competition is

in our agricultural industry as a result of the early decision and vision of persons who established land grant colleges and implemented a system whereby research and development was quickly funneled into the hands of practitioners, and the practitioners who treated it with contempt at first learned to use it and use it well.

It is our conclusion that the most practical and innovative component of the President's America 2000 blueprint is the proposal for the establishment of American 2000 committees in each congressional district. This vital element of America 2000 is in harmony with the recommendation which was first set forth in a preliminary report issued by the Subcommittee on Select Education.

We are all in agreement that education cannot be significantly improved unless all forces within communities come together. Business, parents, citizen activists, fraternal organizations, churches and all other interested groups must be involved as much as teachers, researchers and education administrators in order for school improvement to be universal and lasting. H.R. 4014 proposes, through the district education agents and learning grant institutions, a concrete mechanism to facilitate this vital mobilization. The learning grant institutions and district education agents would constitute resources for all of the participants in this complex enterprise.

The district education agents will serve as catalysts, as special enzymes which speed up the processes for improvement and make the activities flow more efficiently and effectively without being consumed in the process. All other professionals serving on America 2000 committees will, of course, be preoccupied with the demands of their day-to-day employment. District education agents will be able to provide the broad perspectives and serve as the adhesives for such collective efforts.

District education agents must first of all be great communicators. The best that is available from research and development must be communicated at all times to the full range of participants in the educational improvement efforts.

I realize we will need to have quite a bit of dialogue about this to further clarify exactly what kind of contribution we think should be made. Congressional districts serve 580,000 people, and we're saying constructs of 580,000 people across the country need help in terms of developing an ongoing system for the improvement of education. They need a vehicle by which the best that is done in research and development will be funneled to them. We hope that we can reach some kind of agreement on this vital component that we have proposed.

Dr. RAVITCH. Mr. Owens, I know that time is short, and let me just take this opportunity to thank you for your interest, thank you for your patience, and thank you for the hard work of your staff. I would tell you that I look forward to working cooperatively and collaboratively with your staff to end up with a conclusion that seems to be best for the Nation and best for the improvement of education. Thank you, sir.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. To facilitate communication, I am going to ask the staff member to give you copies of every statement that I read here so that you will have that available to you. I want to thank you very much.

The members of Panel II are Dr. Arthur E. Wise, National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education; Dr. Eva L. Baker and Dr. Robert L. Linn, Co-Directors, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing; Dr. Preston C. Kronkosky, President, Southwest Education Development Laboratory; and Dr. Ann Lieberman, President, American Educational Research Association. Please be seated.

I would like to remind the members of the panel that their written statements will be entered in the record in their entirety. You may proceed, Dr. Wise.

STATEMENTS OF ARTHUR E. WISE, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION; ROBERT L. LINN, PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, AND CO-DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON EVALUATION, STANDARDS, AND STUDENT TESTING (CRESST); PRESTON KRONKOSKY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SOUTHWEST EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY, AUSTIN, TX, APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH; AND ANN LIEBERMAN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Dr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to testify at this hearing on the Educational Research, Development and Dissemination Excellence Act. I have a statement which I have prepared for inclusion in the record. I was going to cover the highlights of that, and I will if time permits. But in the light of what has just preceded, I thought I might make a couple of spontaneous remarks that might be clarifying to the subcommittee.

First I should say that over the last 25 years I have been an educational researcher, an educational research manager, and from time to time a Federal official concerned with educational research matters. I was Associate Director of the old National Institute of Education in its beginning phases, and I helped to draft the legislation creating the U.S. Department of Education, including that portion now known as the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

I happen today to be the president or chief executive officer of an organization called NCATE, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. I had not thought that I would be calling direct reference to my organization, but in light of the discussion of the board which preceded, I thought you might be interested to know about the board which directs my actions.

It is composed of representatives of 27 organizations which appoint representatives to our various bodies. We have four policy-making bodies in total, representing about 75 individuals, named to us by 27 national educational organizations. It works remarkably well. When these 27 organizations or representatives get together, and the topic is teacher education, they reach a high degree of consensus about this topic and help to direct our actions, my actions, the actions of our staff.

What is particularly interesting is that many, if not all, of the organizations that you propose for inclusion in your board are the organizations which direct our actions. They range from the Na-

tional Education Association to the American Federation of Teachers, to the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National School Boards Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, of Science, of Social Studies. We have representatives of the public.

In all 27 organizations, which in various sectors sometimes squabble with one another, nonetheless, when they get together with a common purpose in mind—in our particular instance, teacher education, and your particular concern, educational research, a fact that extrapolates from our circumstance to the circumstance of these institutes—I would suggest that it's quite likely that these representatives would be guided by a common purpose when they gather together to discuss priorities for educational research.

From my long observation of educational research at the Federal level, I believe that it can be characterized by two fundamental problems. One is, of course, the extraordinarily low level of investment which is made; the other is the fact that activities are fractionated and not well-orchestrated for sustained, coordinated, long-term research, which is carried out over a sufficiently long period of time and in a sufficiently large scale to make a difference.

If I may return to my testimony for just a moment, I would like to highlight at least a couple of points. I would like to ask a question, and that question is, why is it the schools of today look so much like the schools of 75 years ago when nearly every other facet of public and private life has been radically transformed? The early 20th century factory, on which our schools are incidentally modeled, is gone. Developments in transportation and communication have changed the way we do business. Breakthroughs in medical knowledge have transformed our lifestyles. The news and information industries have been profoundly reshaped by available technology. Meanwhile, students still sit in groups of 25 to 30, presided over by a single teacher, expected to progress uniformly, one grade, 1 year.

Pundits may speculate on the intransigence of the education establishment; political leaders may despair that the schools are not ready for the 21st century. But one large explanation for the failure of the schools to change has been left unexamined—utterly inadequate investment in educational research and development.

Investments in research and development have fueled the changes we see everywhere in our lives. Industries invest regularly four to seven percent of revenues on R&D. High-tech industries invest up to 20 percent and more. Meanwhile, education invests about $100 million a year on a $300 billion a year enterprise, or a rate of approximately .0003. That is, if I can say it correctly, three thousandths of one percent. This is rather like trying to move an ocean liner with a toy tugboat. No industry could long survive, much less improve, at this level of investment we now make in educational R&D.

President Bush and the Governors have set six ambitious goals for our Nation's schools. Reaching these goals will require overcoming some of the most intractable problems in American education. As the Nation embarks on a restructuring of the education system, it will discover that sound, new knowledge and well-tested products are in short supply. It will also find that many of the proposed so-

called solutions to current problems have little theoretical or empirical grounding. In short, the Nation runs the risk of perpetuating educational "fadism"—an affliction long plaguing our schools where one fad gives way to another and no real improvement takes place.

The old-fashioned factory school was good enough for the industrial age, which provided jobs for both skilled and unskilled workers. Now there are fewer jobs for which relatively low levels of intellectual functioning will suffice. The information age demands an information age school capable of bringing as many students as possible to higher order thinking skills. Today's issues challenge the limits of our knowledge.

President Bush is right in saying that we cannot transform education using the same strategies. We must not repeat the mistakes of the past. Now is the time to restructure our plethora of small Federal research initiatives and place enough money into specific problem areas to effect some real breakthroughs and bring on a new education order. It is clear that the present course of Federal research will not provide sufficient amounts of the dependable knowledge required for educational reform. The proposed National Institutes of Education will help us to create a knowledge base sufficient to advance us toward the Nation's goals.

I will concentrate on just one area. Studies have shown that the experiences of young children are the prime determinants of their self-concept, values and aspirations. As your bill points out, at least half of the public school students in our 25 largest cities are minority children, most of whom live in poverty. We know that at least half of the students entering ninth grade fail to graduate 4 years later.

The prospects of school dropout and undereducation is a promise of unemployment, or low income, poor health, and family instability. For the Nation, the condition of education in many of our cities is a great internal wound that endangers the viability of our urban communities, the health of our economy, and our collective self-esteem. It cannot be denied that the future of the Nation will be influenced more than ever by the quality of the education received by all citizens.

I support this bill, and I support your proposal for an independent national Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board, to guide the research of the institutes. What is extraordinarily important is that such a board will provide the basis for long-term planning and continued commitment to the solution of our major educational ills.

The Congress has an important choice to make. It can continue to depend on the current disjointed and underfunded research and development system to solve the critical educational problems facing the Nation, or it can adopt legislation providing for a mission-driven structure such as has been detailed in the Educational Research, Development and Dissemination Act.

In conclusion, I would just like to clarify the point that Dr. Ravitch made in citing some information which I shared with her upon her arrival in Washington. I pointed out to her that the current budget of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement is not what it was in 1973, when I was Associate Director of

that agency. It is approximately 15 or 20 percent of what it was in 1973. In other words, we were spending five times as much in the early 1970's to attempt to improve education as we are spending today. The disinvestment in educational research and development is an astounding development when one considers the state of American education as perceived by America's most eminent leaders.

Research and development has brought us out of the darkness in so many areas of life, but for some reason we have not been willing to see the applicability of this tried and true strategy for improving our schools. I urge enactment of this legislation.

[The prepared statement of Arthur E. Wise follows:]

TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR E. WISE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee on Select Education:

I am pleased to testify at this hearing on the Educational Research, Development, and Dissemination Excellence Act.

Today we consider an opportunity to fundamentally alter the nation's future. Today we address one major means to reach the national education goals which President Bush has called for and which we all agree are vital. Reaching the goals will require time, effort, money and knowledge. Our base of knowledge derived from educational research is the foundation on which many efforts in this field should rest. But we are not yet working with a sufficient base of knowledge that specifically addresses the problems we face today. It is time to change the structure of the federal education research development and dissemination program.

My interest in this topic is long-standing. From 1973-75 I was an Associate Director of the former National Institute of Education. In the late 1970's I helped to design the U. S. Department of Education, including the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). Recently, I chaired the Government Liaison Committee of the American Educational Research Association which for the past several years has studied the question of how to improve the education research capacity of the nation.

The stream of events characterized by efforts to establish and achieve national goals for education, the ongoing state reform movement in education, and the powerful change potential of ideas suggested by restructuring have produced a climate of almost desperate

attentiveness to schooling and learning phenomena. There is heightened concern among a broad range of society: the business community, advocates for the disadvantaged, teachers and administrators, and the political leadership of the nation.

We agree that sweeping, fundamental changes in our education system must be made. But the task cannot be left to school personnel or demonstration projects alone to solve. The *National Goals* statement calls for transformation in education. We agree that it is time for a "new educational order" in which success for all students is the preeminent national goal. President Bush's plan calls for research and development centers to create "New American Schools," on which to base a renaissance in education. These schools will be expected to produce extraordinary gains in student learning. But without new knowledge of the education process, we are destined to repeat the mistakes of the past. With some notable exceptions we have not achieved sufficient breakthroughs in our understanding of the problems facing our students and our schools today. Incremental change in the educational research structure, such as the creation of a few new schools, will not do if America's leaders are truly seeking transformational change in education.

Developing "New American Schools" requires more than short-term applied research and development projects which are called for in the current plan. Creating these schools should be a part of a comprehensive approach in a federally-initiated education research program grounded on sound basic and applied educational research. This comprehensive approach has long been missing in plans for education reform.

The Need for Transformation in Educational Research

We must create new connections between what is discovered through research, the policies developed by political and school leadership, and the structures in which administrators and teachers practice. Today's knowledge base is not sufficient to answer the questions we have, some of which have come about in the past ten years as the result of the dramatic change in composition of our nation's students.

For example, relying on what we know today will not begin to address the tremendous need of children born addicted to crack/cocaine. According to the National Association for Perinatal Addiction Research and Education, about one out of every 10 newborns in the U. S. (about 375,000 per year) is exposed in the womb to one or more illicit drugs. The most frequent ingredient in the mix is cocaine. In major cities such as New York, Los Angeles, Detroit and Washington, many hospitals report that the percentage of newborns showing the effects of drugs is 20 percent or higher. Special schooling requirements for these children will cost significantly more than the typical per pupil expenditure. In Boston, a year of special education for a drug-exposed child can cost $13,000 compared with $5,000 per child at a regular school.

In addition to the escalating and now in many cases congenital drug problem, we are faced with other issues which challenge the limits of our knowledge. In many major cities the dropout rate for students is now over 30 percent. By the year 2000, an estimated 3.4 million limited English proficient school age children will be entering the school system. Teachers from the middle class will be teaching students from backgrounds vastly different from their own. Minorities will be a majority in many schools. What we know today about teaching these students is still vastly inadequate.

Much more research needs to be conducted on teaching and learning strategies. Our schools, other than a few demonstration projects and some progressive systems, are still operating under the concept of the "factory school," which taught the skills and habits needed by a newly industrialized society in the early 1900's. Now our leaders seek to alter the mission and structure of today's schools to mirror the transformation of today's economy from an industrial to an information age. How can we work with our students to achieve higher levels of abstract reasoning ability? How should we structure our schools to deliver it?

The knowledge base we have developed thus far has made a difference in the ways we structure learning experiences for certain populations. Research has had a profound influence

on how we educate students with disabilities and on young children. Prior to 1965, we focused a major share of our efforts on adolescents and middle school children. Research revealed the importance of early childhood intervention. Research on mainstreaming students with disabilities has led to better diagnosis of learning problems and improved practice. Research on pre-referral intervention strategies has led to a 25 to 50 percent reduction in the need for special education. The latter breakthrough came as a result of sustained, relatively well-funded efforts. We have not accomplished the same in other targeted areas. Why? We have not committed ourselves to conducting the amount or type of research needed to provide some answers to our problems. Educational research has been consistently under-funded. We cannot transform schools without additional knowledge about teaching and learning. America is now at a critical juncture. Will we give ourselves a chance to transform our nation's schools, or will we simply create additional short-term demonstration projects which, history shows, have never fundamentally altered the schools?

The Current Funding Situation

Federal, state and local spending on our education system totals about $300 billion per year. Approximately $100 million is designated for education research; this is approximately .0003 percent (three ten thousandths of one percent) of the total amount of $300 billion. Some companies in private industry spend as little as five percent of their operating budgets for research and development (many companies do better). However, in one of our top industries, computer services, the top five companies spend 16 to 28 percent of their budgets on research and development (Perleman, 1989). These companies know that they must create new products and services, and that they must do it through implementing adequate research programs to stay ahead of the competition and survive in an increasingly crowded international market.

We do a much poorer job of investing in our nation's most valuable resource--our children. We have a long way to go toward even designating five percent of the total funding effort on educational research. The amount allocated for research on teaching and learning is

infinitesimal; it is shameful. No industry could long survive, much less improve at the level of investment we now make in educational research and development. We have spent more on building one stealth bomber than the Secretary proposes for the entire America 2000 research strategy. The National Institutes of Health is spending one billion, five hundred fifty-four million dollars this fiscal year on cancer research. With this level of funding, we are making progress toward diagnosis and treatment of cancer. Unless we make a comparable commitment to our nation's children, we are shortchanging our nation's future and our chance to compete with other post-industrial countries on an equal basis in the twenty-first century.

Funding of education research is a historical function of the federal government and one for which it bears singular responsibility. Corporations and foundations do support some education projects and demonstration programs but they seldom support research. A National Academy of Education survey of 28 major foundations discovered that less than four percent of grants from these foundations are targeted for education research.

The federal government has, regrettably, not exercised good stewardship in this area. Indeed, over the past two decades, the federal government has been systematically disinvesting in educational research. According to the General Accounting Office, the federal investment in educational research and development declined by 33 percent in real terms between 1980 and 1987; during this same period, federal investment in research and development in all areas increased by 24 percent. (GAO, 1988). These reductions have not been accomplished without damage to the federal research program in education. In a 1987 study, the GAO emphasized the consequences of such neglect:

> "The shift away from new data collection by the research units may have serious long-term consequences for education . . . prior research may quickly lose its relevance or it may be too low in technical adequacy to sustained continued reapplication to new questions. New data must constantly be produced to meet both departmental and Congressional requirements...If it is not, information will be foregone and policies will be based on less than the most complete, relevant and timely data (p. 27)."

As the nation embarks on a restructuring of the education system, it will discover that sound new knowledge and well tested products are in short supply. It will also find that many of the proposed "solutions" to current problems have little theoretical or empirical grounding. In short, it runs the risk of perpetuating educational "fadism"--an affliction long present in our schools where one fad gives way to another and no real improvement takes place.

If the marginal change approach to reauthorization is the road taken, the most that can be expected is a slightly larger amount of money for field-initiated research. The New Development School Corporation will make a one-time small investment in a small number of initiatives. The plan states that "once the R&D is complete and the schools are launched, the operating costs of the New American Schools will be about the same as those of conventional schools." The fallacy here is that the limited amount of short-term applied research designated to launch the schools would be adequate for the task. For example, research on cooperative learning has shown it to be a promising approach to teaching and learning. Much more research needs to be conducted to determine how to implement this and other promising ideas on a widescale basis.

The President's plan states that "some schools may radically alter the customary modes of teaching and learning and redesign the human relationships and organizational structures of the school." The goal is one we can all support, but it will not be achieved without a long-term commitment and adequate funding resources to conduct longitudinal and basic research studies. *Short-term field projects are not an adequate base on which to change our entire system.* The New American Schools will not solve the long-standing, underlying

and intractable problems of America's schools. We must know more if we are to increase the percent of children who can function at a high cognitive level.

With the relatively large number of current research and development centers which are poorly funded for their work, a large proportion of the education research dollar goes to overhead--to travel, conference attendance, information dissemination, so that the amount left for actual research is even smaller than it appears. The 1993 budget request seeks additional funds for education but we are still operating with approximately 20 research centers funded at a total of $27.4 million, just over one million dollars per center. The President's plan calls for American businesses and other donors to contribute $150 to $200 million but so far fund-raising has fallen very short. Why does educational R&D have to rely on the largesse of industry? The poor response so far may be indicative of the fact that corporate leaders have concluded that this is a federal government responsibility.

Needed: A Long Term Outlook

The federal government has the clear responsibility to lead the research and development effort in education. The last significant effort was the creation of the National Institute of Education in 1971, which was initially funded at $125 million, but whose budget was quickly reduced in succeeding years so that long-term research could not be accomplished. Much pressure was brought to bear to change NIE's mission from a focus on long-term basic research to short-term projects relating to practice. In recent years the NIH and NSF also found themselves under executive branch and Congressional pressure to emphasize short-term impact at the expense of long-term inquiry. There is pressure to do something now--the "before the next election" syndrome. This is understandable, but some problems cannot be solved in one or two years. "Scientific inquiry into the educational process" was the original Congressional mandate for the NIE. In the history of education to date, scientific inquiry has had only a limited impact upon school practices. An explanation of this failure is our serious underinvestment in research into the educational process as well as a lack of sustained focus.

It is tempting to think that we can solve our problems with demonstration project after demonstration project. Many studies have documented that this approach is not sufficient. Projects can be useful, but without significant research, we are stirring the waters only enough to muddy them--and not enough to see clear results. Longitudinal research on children's growth and development may not be as politically appealing as the idea of a test to measure results. However, the results of standardized tests won't show much progress if we do not find new ways to help children learn.

It is a time of extreme challenge for the nation. With the changes in immigration patterns over the last 20 years, we now have a very different clientele in our schools than we did in the 1960's and 70's. The multicultural society has arrived at the same time as the information age. Higher level skills are now required to develop and service new automated technologies. At the same time, we have a dramatic increase in the number of children entering our schools whose native language is not English. The last great wave of immigration occurred as America entered the industrial age. Generations of immigrants were educated. Some reached the heights of intellectual functioning; many did not, but there were plenty of jobs for which relatively low levels of intellectual functioning sufficed. Now for the new immigrants to function, for America to flourish, and for America not to become two societies, we must find new methods of teaching and new approaches to learning. President Bush is right in saying that we cannot transform education using the same strategies. Now is the time to restructure our plethora of small federal research initiatives and place enough money into specific problem areas to effect some real findings and breakthroughs.

The current research structure within OERI is not mission-oriented. The Office of Research in OERI, for example, is organized by general area: education and society; schools and school professionals. This type of organization does not create a compelling set of targets for research. In addition, the current system has very limited resources. As a consequence it cannot be held accountable for results.

Federal Leadership Through the National Institutes of Education

It is clear that the present course of federal research will not provide sufficient amounts of the dependable knowledge required for education reform. Congressman Owens' bill - H.R. 4014 which proposes creation of the **National Institutes of Education** will help us create a knowledge base sufficient to resolve problems that are presently regarded as intractable. The most important task is to change the thinking about education research from a collection of activities designed years ago to problem-driven, mission-oriented, adequately funded research institutes.

The federal government's approach to special education already serves as a positive illustration of the potential for progress through research. Currently, the Department of Education supports the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, funded at about $68.4 million per year. The importance of this national institute is both in its mandate and its funding level. Enough money has been allocated to effect a significant amount of research. The mandate of the institute provides for a comprehensive and coordinated approach to the conduct of research, demonstration projects and related activities. The approach integrates research, development and dissemination. There is a clear focus: individuals with disabilities. The research generated through this institute is having a profound influence on the way we educate students with disabilities.

The same type of results can be expected from the proposed National Institute for the Education of At-Risk Students, The National Institute for Innovation in Educational Governance and Management, The National Institute for Early Childhood Education, the National Institute for Student Achievement, and the National Institute for Literacy, Post-Secondary Education and Lifelong Learning. All of the institutes are needed; all are important in helping us gain answers to the many questions we have about how to remedy the problems in our schools. In particular, the at-risk student institute and the early childhood institute should yield guidance on strategies in working with our at-risk children, including minority children, in American cities. We know that the experiences of young children are the prime determinants of their self-concept, values and aspirations. As Congressman Owens'

bill points out, at least half of the public school students in our 25 largest cities are minority children, most of whom live in poverty. We know that at least half of the students entering ninth grade fail to graduate four years later. We must develop more early intervention strategies to change the path of these youngsters.

The centralized structure of the National Institutes would also eliminate unnecessary duplication. The mission approach would solve some of the administrative quagmires in which the current OERI has found itself. Current labs would continue their activities and support the various institutes in appropriate ways. Centers, operating at the current million or two million dollars a year, could be dedicated to one institute or could serve several institutes. With a mission on which to focus their efforts and with sufficient resources to deal with major education problems, current centers can address the objectives of each institute.

I support the proposal for an independent National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board to guide the research of the Institutes. As Chairman Owens' bill indicates, this will provide for a much needed continuity of leadership in educational research. The Board's bipartisan nature will help to ensure research initiatives are adequately and consistently funded.

Once again, this Committee has an important choice to make. It can continue to depend on the current disjointed and under-funded research and development system to solve critical education problems facing the nation, or it can adopt legislation providing for a mission-driven structure such as has been outlined in the Educational Research, Development, and Dissemination Excellence Act.

I urge the enactment of this legislation.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Dr. Robert Linn.

Dr. LINN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to testify today on the needs of research in the area of assessment.

I am a professor at the University of Colorado and Co-Director of the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing with Eva Baker. Eva Baker was scheduled to testify today but we were able to save some resources by my being here to do that. The testimony, though, that you have in writing, is submitted on behalf of both of us and I would like to highlight some of that.

The focus is to argue that there is a need for expanded research in the area of assessment. It hardly comes as a surprise to hear that a researcher would argue that we need more research. But we come to this based on extensive interactions with a number of agencies and groups such as the National Council for Education Standards and Testing, and in work with other agencies around the country that are concerned about assessment.

The many interested parties are arguing that assessment should serve many needs—accountability, a way to improve instruction, a way to certify student accomplishments. They want assessment to do many things, and as Art Wise said in his testimony, there is some danger that it could be that another bad assessment is now the solution to our problems. They not only want this, but they want it now. They want it in a different form than we've been seeing in the past. We are seeing calls, under various names, for performance assessment, alternative assessment, instead of the tests that people are most familiar with—portfolios of work, projects, extended essays and the like.

This movement is motivated for many good reasons. There are many things that are unknown about it and there's an extensive need for research to support this.

Our own research at the center is focused on some of these alternative ways of assessing, and we think we have made substantial progress in at least two areas of history and science assessment that would satisfy some of these needs. However, in order to even approximate the appetite for the new assessments, there is a need for extended and programmatic research in the area of assessment. Some of these questions will take substantial time to answer, and that's why you need the programmatic approach.

Let me just list a few of the types of questions that need to be addressed with regard to alternative assessment:

How fair are performance assessments to children of different backgrounds? How does gender impact performance when new types of assessments are used? How do we assure that economically disadvantaged, limited English-proficient, or special populations such as the learning disabled students are fairly treated in these assessments?

Part of the argument for a new type of assessment is that they would impact on instruction in more positive ways. We need to have research that shows how, in fact, these new assessments impact on research. Some of the experience from the past, when testing programs were put in place with intentions to improve education, has been shown to not always have those intended effects.

We need to ask questions about new types of assessments with regard to their corruptibility. Are they more corruptible or less corruptible in existing types of measures? We need to ask questions about the degree to which these assessments can serve the multiple purposes that I listed earlier on—the purpose of improving instruction in the classroom, to accountability of the system as a whole, to the certification of student performance. We need to understand better how teachers can be involved in this activity, how best to involve them in the use of new assessments as well as old assessments.

In coming to solutions to these problems, we need to also worry about the issue of communication. How do we communicate better the results of student assessments to parents and the public? Past experience has focused heavily on simple answers, a single number, an average, or a single number for an individual student. The new types of assessment may change this by providing more detail. We need to find ways of communicating information more broadly and not rely exclusively on abstractions of a single score or an average.

Most of these questions are under study now. Some of them are going to take considerable time to answer. The questions I have focused on so far focus primarily on student outcomes. There is another whole arena in which assessment work is greatly needed and that has to do with how to determine the quality of schooling itself.

Now, certainly you can argue under certain circumstances that the performance of students gives you an indication of the performance of the school. But it is, at best, indirect, and there are many other links. We need to have a better sense of how we can describe the experiences that students have in the school environment.

Why, for example, should we expect children to do well in a school and have high test scores if their schools are not a safe place to be? Why should we expect children to excel when they may not have challenging textbooks, or enough of any books to go around? So, understanding something about what goes on in the school as well as the assessment of the children's performance is important. In order to understand the results from any tests, whether multiple choice or performance-based, we need to be able to make accurate statements about what school experiences are like and how they relate to student outcomes. If we cannot, we will never solve the equity problem.

During the deliberations of the National Council on Education Standards and Testing, issues of school experiences wee addressed in several ways. They were discussed in terms of the issue of delivery standards for the schools and for systems. They were discussed as part of what is needed evidence before assessments would be certified, and they were discussed, as necessary, to assure the implementation of educational reform.

This was a very controversial topic throughout the discussions of the National Council. To some, it implied a prescriptive or controlling function that was frightening from inside the beltway. To others, it conjured up the horrors of more check lists or paperwork that were mandated but largely unread.

We must be able to conduct research on the assessment of delivery standards, on the school experiences themselves, to determine

if we can develop good, cost-effective information that helps schools reach their potential and serve the interests of their students.

The National Council on Education Standards and Testing also focused on the importance of assessing the impact of the spate of new assessment systems themselves. I have already spoken to this idea. The idea there was to have a long-term, independent study of new testing policies that would be strengthened and preserved within OERI.

As the Office of Technology Assessment's recent report summarized, "Congress has an important role to play in supporting R&D in educational testing, because adequate funding cannot be expected from other sources." Because the testing and assessment agenda is essential for understanding educational quality, we must be sure that long-term, Federal-supported programs of research on assessment are continued.

All research must be conducted by a mix of research providers—and I'm certainly not intending to argue that centers are the only way. Independent researchers, commercial companies, and State agencies are among the many within that mix. But we wish to speak about the importance of preserving programmatic research orientation of the National R&D centers, centers which have made, and can continue to make, important contributions to knowledge and practice in assessment, as well as in the area of school organizations, learning, policy and teaching.

What a center on assessment does is to serve as a trusted source for impartial analysis on important issues and as a focal point for creative research to help solve and understand our problems. We at CRESST field questions constantly from a variety of sources, questions that come from congressional staff, from the administration, from State legislators, the press, educational institutions, and individual parents, teachers and representatives of the business community. This contact informs our research, but it also points to the fact that there is a need out there. We are not called upon because we're a single source of dissemination. We are called upon because of the quality of the research that's provided and how it is valued.

Individual researchers alone working on small projects cannot meet this sort of need. The bombardment of questions from the field keeps us close to the real issues of assessment.

In summary, we believe that educational assessment should be a significant part of the research plans of OERI. We believe that we all must address issues of the assessment of individuals and schools, measuring standards for students and institutions, to be sure that our expectations for assessment work for the good of children and for the future of our country.

We also believe that for all the range of issues identified by the proposed OERI institutes, and particularly for assessment, long-term, programmatic research by university-based R&D centers should be an essential element in the American R&D network.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Robert L. Linn follows:]

Statement of

Eva L. Baker
Professor, University of California, Los Angeles

Robert L. Linn
Professor, University of Colorado

Co-Directors
National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing
(CRESST)

before the Subcommittee on Select Education
Committee on Education and Labor
U.S. House of Representatives

March 17, 1992

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to testify on the topic of needed research in educational assessment. My name is Robert Linn. I am a professor at the University of Colorado and co-director with Eva Baker of the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST). Although she was scheduled to speak today, I was able to save resources by substituting for her. This testimony is provided on behalf of us both.

We wish to address our remarks to the need for expanded research in the area of assessment. It is not surprising to hear of the importance of research from a researcher. But we draw our position from a larger context—from the public discussion surrounding educational reform. In the deliberation of the National Council for Standards and Testing, in the debate among participants on the Council's Task Force on Assessment, and in the summary of the report released by the Office of Technology Assessment on Testing, it is clear that the public, educators, and policymakers have multiple expectations for tests and

make many assumptions about the validity of the information tests and assessments provide.

These interested parties want assessment for accountability, for instructional improvement, for certifying student accomplishments, and they want them now.

A case in point is the national attention to assessments of student performance, using projects, experiments, essays, and portfolios instead of more familiar types of testing. CRESST researchers will provide information on the validity of some of these tests for different uses, and guidelines to develop and validate these measures. We already have results in CRESST's research on history and science assessments that we believe will make performance assessment significantly more cost effective and valid. But in order to begin to approximate the appetite of the public for test information—and to assure for ourselves and others that testing supports rather than impedes student learning, additional questions require sustained attention.

Let us list a few.

How fair are performance assessments to children of different backgrounds? How does gender impact performance when new types of assessments are used? How do we assure that economically disadvantaged or limited English-Proficient, or special populations, such as the learning disabled, are fairly treated?

How is fairness influenced by different administrative procedures and scoring procedures? How should comparability of design or administration be judged? How should comparability of test results be determined?

What is the impact of various programs of instruction on these new tests? Do the assessments measure the things we wish to teach? What kinds of important learnings can be measured? How general or transferable is performance from project to project or test to test or to other important

accomplishments? How do these assessments predict readiness for the workforce or for postsecondary education?

Are performance tests less or more corruptible than traditional tests? How trustworthy are our findings and what steps can increase our confidence in test performance?

Can multiple purposes of assessment be simultaneously served with validity? Can an assessment contribute to teaching and learning and accountability? What is the impact of new assessments on students and on the quality of life in school?

What are the best ways for teachers to be involved in the design and use of new assessments? What ways are cost effective? What ways contribute directly to student learning? How can the design of new assessments build upon our knowledge of thinking and learning?

How should we measure students' ability to integrate across subject matter areas? How should we measure their effort, thinking processes, and habits of mind?

How should we integrate the range of assessment options before us to provide the best information, with the most positive consequences and within reasonable costs?

Beyond the solutions to these problems, we must develop improved ways to communicate the results of student assessments. Many believe that testing has developed in the manner it has in part because of the public's desires for easy, understandable answers – answers that depend on numbers. Changing the basis of assessment to more concrete analyses of children's performance may very well change the kind of information policymakers and the public receive. Research on how to communicate complex information is essential if real improvements in assessment are to be possible. We must show details and realities of what children can do rather than exclusively rely on abstractions, like scores and averages. We will also find ways to reach out to all parents who need to have good information about their schools – and who need that information in a form that they can use to support children's growth and accomplishments.

Most of these questions are under study now. Some of them will take considerable time to answer. The questions listed share a focus on student outcomes. However, we believe we must make a substantial effort to address another class of questions about educational reform. Especially if educational reform is to be systemic, we must focus the attention of scholars and talented practitioners on how to assess the quality of schooling itself. Clearly, under certain conditions, we can infer something about instruction from student performance. But many of us worry that we have not paid enough attention to the description of student experiences and school environments. Why should we expect children to do well in school – and have high test scores – if their schools may not be safe? Why should we expect children to excel when they may not have challenging textbooks, or enough of any books to go around? How can they have homework without paper? In order to understand the results from any tests, whether multiple-choice, or performance-based, we need to be able to make accurate statements about what school experiences are like and how they relate to student outcomes. If we cannot, we will never solve the equity problem.

During the deliberations of the National Council on Education Standards and Testing, issues of school experiences and environments were discussed in at least three different ways. First, they were discussed in the light of "delivery standards" for the schools and for systems. Secondly, they were discussed as part of needed evidence before assessments were to be certified for use for a "high stakes" purpose, such as to promote or graduate a student. Third, delivery standards were discussed as necessary to assure the implementation of educational reform. Delivery standards were an extremely controversial topic. To some, they implied a prescriptive or controlling function, a way to homogenize

schools and classrooms from inside the beltway. To others, they conjured up horrors of more checklists, paperwork, and mandated but unread reports.

We must be able to conduct research on the assessment of delivery standards—on school experiences—to determine if we can develop good, cost-effective information that helps schools reach their potential and serve the interests of their students. If we do not undertake this research, we will perhaps always have nagging questions about the quality of our judgments and the fairness of decisions made on student outcomes alone.

The National Council on Education Standards and Testing also focused on the importance of assessing the impact of the spate of assessment activity. The idea, a long-term, independent study of new testing policies should be strengthened and preserved in the OERI.

As the Office of Technology Assessment Summary of the Report, *Testing in American Schools: Asking the Right Questions* observes, "Congress has an important role to play in supporting R&D in educational testing, because adequate funding cannot be expected from other sources" (1992, p.36). Because the testing and assessment agenda is essential for understanding educational quality, we must be sure that long-term, Federally-supported programs of research on assessment are continued.

National R&D Centers

All research must be conducted by a mix of research providers: individual researchers, commercial companies, and state agencies. But we wish to speak

about the importance of preserving the programmatic research orientation of National R&D Centers—Centers which have made and can continue to make important contributions to knowledge and practice in assessment, as well as in areas such as school organizations, learning, policy, and teaching. What a Center on assessment does is to serve as a trusted source for impartial analysis on important issues, and as a focal point for creative research to help solve and understand our problems. CRESST regularly fields requests from Congressional staff, members of the Administration, State legislators, the press, educational institutions, and individual parents, teachers and representatives of the business community. They want to know the state of knowledge in assessment. On last Friday, one of us had calls from the press, the Arts community on alternative assessment, a technology company on portfolios, two non-profits, asking about workforce readiness, a school psychologist, a teacher, and a graduate student about what we knew and where they could go for additional help. The other of us was meeting with the Math Science Education Board's Study Group on Guidelines for Mathematic Assessment. During the week, we talked to school district and state administrators, university researchers at many sites, planned a principal's workshop, an international meeting at UCLA on assessment, a seminar for state legislators, met with the Chicago educational reform community, and finished four progress reports due to OERI. Saturday, we presented our results on what we have learned about performance assessment to more than 200 teachers. Today, one of us will meet with colleagues from the State Alternative Assessment Exchange and the National Assessment Governing Board to work on problems of linking and comparing results from different assessment systems. And that was just one week. CRESST is called not because its single purpose is dissemination, it is called upon because the quality of its research productivity is valued.

Individual researchers alone, working on small projects, simply cannot meet needs of this sort. The bombardment of questions from the field keeps us close to real problems and issues on assessment, though housed in universities we may be, and allows us to adjust research programs in the light of our data as well as in terms of the practical problems we confront daily. Furthermore, because we are researchers, we are careful to give information within the boundaries of our knowledge.

The idea of a Center program is important and it works, it should be retained within the newly proposed OERI structure for assessment, as well. CRESST's strength resides in the ability of teams of researchers to propose their own theories, strategies, and methods within the guidelines of expectations from the OERI, informed by what they learn from research and by their interaction with the field. The capacity and sustained attention to complex assessment research problems requires long term programs and significant resources.

In summary, we believe that educational assessment should be a significant part of the research plans of OERI. We believe that we all must address issues of the assessment of individuals and schools measuring standards for students and institutions—to be sure that our expectations for assessment work for the good of children and for the future of our country. We also believe that for all the range of issues identified by the proposed OERI institutes, and particularly for assessment, long-term, programmatic research by university-based R&D Centers should be an essential element in the American R&D network.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Dr. Kronkosky.

Dr. KRONKOSKY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, good morning. My name is Preston Kronkosky. I am executive director of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, headquartered in Austin, TX, which has a board of directors similar in composition to that which H.R. 4014 proposes. In fact, three members of my board of directors are in the audience today. One difference between our board and the board proposed in H.R. 4014 is that my board has the right to hire and fire me.

I appear before you today representing the Council for Educational Development and Research. The Council is the association of regional educational laboratories and what we think are the best university-based research centers. Thank you for this opportunity to express our views on the issues before you today.

But before I do that, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Ballenger, my colleagues and I congratulate and praise you and your subcommittee for your work in support of educational reform. You have put together a long-awaited, logical, and coordinated infrastructure for educational research and development. It has been a pleasure to work with this subcommittee to fulfill this critical need.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by telling you something about the beliefs and vision that underpin the work of the research centers and regional educational laboratories that belong to the Council.

Congress established long-term, in-depth, programmatic research centers to give us an understanding of the intricacies involved in improving schools. It establish regional educational laboratories to be the Federal Government's helping hands in developing, testing, and disseminating new educational ideas and technologies. As a result of our experience in pursuing this charge, we have developed certain beliefs about the role of educational research and development in reform. These believes were recently articulated by our Council chairman, Dean Nafziger, executive director of the Far West Laboratory headquartered in San Francisco, CA. The following ideas are taken from his remarks at the Council's annual meeting last November, remarks that the Council subsequently published.

One of the things we believe is that research and development and does not reform schools. Reform happens at schools. R&D helps with the best research and thinking, with the best tools and training, with the best people, and, today more than ever, with the moral support human beings need when they risk dramatic change.

Research centers and regional educational laboratories are partners in the reform expedition. But we don't just bring supplies and equipment. We hold the lantern and advise which path to take through the thicket. Generally, school people listen to us because, among the many purveyors of advice, they see us as impartial truth tellers. Practitioners trust us because they know our only interest is in making schools the best they can be for all children.

In other words, our role is leadership. No matter how political winds blow, our institutions hold fast to a set of beliefs about schooling too important in this democracy to ignore.

Something else we deeply believe in is America's institution of universal, free education. We don't believe that the primary purpose of schooling is to select and sort, winnow out the elite and channel the rest into a socially-stratified work force. We believe the purpose of schools is to give all kids an equal chance.

We also believe that for democracy to succeed, we must educate every child, not just for the sake of global competitiveness, but because we must produce good voters, good parents, and good citizens. We need people who can assume stewardship of our institutions and our future.

From this follows another belief: the interests of children must drive the school enterprise. Our children's growth and development is being seriously stunted. The most obvious reasons are poverty and neglect. We agree with the authors of a book called the "One Place," when they say that schools should be the one place "where children get what they need—nurturing, guidance, development, and the ability to learn." Instead of adding to the instability in a child's life, "school can become the very core of it."

Another of our beliefs is that schools can't do this alone. They must work in partnership with their communities. Schools are embedded in the culture of the community. The two are interdependent.

John Dewey once said that the whole community must want for its schools what the best and wisest parent wants for his or her own child. To achieve that ideal today, schools must overcome learning barriers that reach far beyond the classroom—the effects of changing family patterns, escalating child poverty, violence, drugs, and teen pregnancy. Breaking through these barriers means joining forces with parents, business, elected officials, and social agencies under creative new collaborations.

Now I come to one of our most fundamental beliefs: real change in schools does not come from outside the system. It begins with insiders. By this I don't mean that change must always be bottom-up. There is a place for both top-down and bottom-up leadership. Whether you see today's schools as promising institutions, or you think schools need to be entirely reinvented, you can't reach your vision by ignoring the wisdom and commitment of practitioners.

Decisions about school reform require the involvement of teachers, principals, parents, and local superintendents. These people give us the wisdom of practice. Teachers and administrators are partners in educational R&D, not merely recipients of it. We capture their insights and experience so that other practitioners can profit from it. And they, in turn, become our respected and treasured colleagues, not pawns to be manipulated.

One last believe I want to mention is almost a given in the current educational reform context: we believe that schools need comprehensive, systemic change. There's pretty wide agreement—no matter what your ideology—that we need to fundamentally rethink the way we organize and operate schools.

A systemic orientation means realizing and taking advantage of the fact that change in one part of the system necessarily affects every other part of the system. As we mast system dynamics and seek interventions that will give us the greatest leverage, we must

never lose sight of our purposes. We have to keep asking, what need do children have for this change?

We must give the highest priority to local flexibility. Teachers and principals must have the training, the leeway, and the resources to initiate reforms for purposes dictated by their communities.

These are the beliefs to which our members hold, Mr. Chairman. There is a great deal in H.R. 4014, the "Educational Research, Development and Dissemination Excellence Act," to indicate that we and this subcommittee are guided by the same core beliefs and the same vision for schools. To achieve our vision, we need a stable Federal infrastructure for educational research and development.

H.R. 4014 does this by addressing the five functions of Federal education research and development programs—research, development, dissemination, technical assistance, and the establishment of information and reference systems. H.R. 4014 also requires that these functions come together in a truly coordinated system.

Many of our views on H.R. 4014 have been communicated to this subcommittee previously. My comments today are on the second draft of the bill that was shared with us last week.

We like the modifications you have made in this draft. We like that the governing board in this infrastructure is highly accountable to Congress. In addition, you have resolved the constitutional problems we raised earlier with this subcommittee.

We support public standards setting as an appropriate role for the board. We welcome the open process through which the Office of Educational Research and Improvement will meet its legitimate needs for high quality scientific and technical staff. We like that you have considerably simplified and strengthened the advisory system for the various components of the R&D infrastructure.

We delight that you have recognized this Nation's need for long-term programmatic research by maintaining research centers. The success of development, dissemination and technical assistance depends on the work of these enduring research institutions. No one has more depth and has made a bigger contribution in assessment than the Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing at UCLA. Similarly, no one has a better understanding of how schools affect disadvantaged kids than the caring people at the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students at Johns Hopkins University.

I know that some would have you believe that the endurance of these institutions presents a problem. Just the opposite is true. Some of the major obstacles in research and development have been the constant churning with which these institutions have had to live and the lack of resolve in the Federal R&D system.

Moreover, we like the coordination that H.R. 4014 requires of the regional education laboratories and the National Diffusion Network. We have wanted to forge closer ties between these two groups for a long time.

We agree that regional educational laboratories should work on the research priorities listed in H.R. 4014. These are: one, the education of at-risk students; two, the education and development of young children; three, student achievement in core subject areas through elementary and secondary schooling; four, literacy, post-

secondary education, and lifelong learning for adults; and five, the improvement of schools through the restructuring and reform of school governance, policymaking, finance and management at the State, local, school building, and classroom level.

Just let me add here, Mr. Chairman, that you have filled an important gap by broadening the research to include lifelong learning and literacy.

In the few moments that I have remaining to address the subcommittee, I am going to focus on areas which, in our view, would strengthen H.R. 4014 even more.

First, we urge you to remain steadfast in your decision to provide for research centers. In fact, we suggest that you set aside at least one-third of each institute's funding for long-term, programmatic research conducted at these centers.

Second, we recommend that ten percent of each institute's funding be devoted to field-initiated studies.

Third, we would like this subcommittee to more thoroughly define the role of development. It is fairly easy to call for equity and educational improvement and to write these terms into legislation and research agendas. It is more difficult to get change down into schools.

I have more extensive remarks in my paper, but for the purposes of time I will skip the next four or five pages.

Finally, our fourth recommendation is really a plea. Mr. Chairman and members of this subcommittee, if you are going to place regional educational laboratories into a dissemination component, please carefully define what you mean by that term. To us, dissemination means the transfer of ideas and products from their original sites to other sites. It includes planning, designing, and conducting activities that lead to the application of research and development in meeting educational needs. We have elaborated on this definition in our previous comments to you. We hope you will again consider them.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ballenger, once again I thank you and the subcommittee and hope you will call on us if there is anything we can do to further your subcommittee's already fine work.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Preston C. Kronksoky follows:]

Preston Kronkosky
Executive Director
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
on behalf of the
Council for Educational Development and Research

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am Preston Kronkosky, executive director of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory in Austin, Texas. I appear before you today representing the Council for Educational Development and Research. The Council is the association of regional educational laboratories and what we think are the best university-based research centers. Thank you for this opportunity to express our views on the issues before you today.

But before I do that, Mr. Chairman, I and my colleagues congratulate and praise you and your subcommittee for your work in support of educational reform. You have put together a long-awaited, logical, and coordinated infrastructure for educational research and development. It has been a pleasure to work with this subcommittee to fulfill this critical need.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to begin by telling you something about the beliefs and vision that underpin the work of the research centers and regional educational laboratories that belong to the Council.

Congress established long-term, in-depth, programmatic research centers to give us an understanding of the intricacies involved in improving schools. It established regional educational laboratories to be the federal government's helping hands in developing, testing and disseminating new educational ideas and technologies. As a result of our experience pursuing this charge, we have developed certain beliefs about the role of educational research and development in reform. These beliefs were recently articulated by our Council chairman, Dean Nafziger, executive director of the Far West Laboratory in San Francisco. The following ideas are taken from his remarks at the Council's annual meeting last November -- remarks that the Council subsequently published.

One of the things we believe is that research and development does not reform schools. Reform happens at schools. R&D helps with the best research and thinking, with the best tools and training, with the best people, and (today more than ever) with the moral support human beings need when they risk dramatic change.

Research centers and regional educational laboratories are partners in the reform expedition. But we don't just bring supplies and equipment; we hold the lantern and advise which path to take through the thicket. Generally, school people listen to us because, among the many purveyors of advice, they see us as impartial truth tellers. Practitioners trust us because they know our only interest is in making schools the best they can be for children.

In other words, our role is leadership. No matter how political winds blow, our institutions hold fast to a set of beliefs about schooling too important in this democracy to ignore.

Something else we deeply believe in is America's institution of universal, free education. We don't believe that the primary purpose of schooling is to select and sort, winnow out the elite and channel the rest into a socially stratified work force. We believe the purpose of schools is to give all kids an equal chance.

We also believe that for democracy to succeed, we must educate every child, not just for the sake of global competitiveness, but because we must produce good voters, good parents, and good citizens. We need people who can assume stewardship of our institutions and our future.

From this follows another belief: The interests of children must drive the school enterprise. Our children's growth and development is being seriously stunted. The most obvious reasons are poverty and neglect. We agree with the authors of a book called the *One Place* when they say that schools should be the one place "where children get what they need -- nurturing, guidance, development, and the ability to learn." Instead of

adding to the instability in a child's life, "school can become the very core of it."

Another of our beliefs is that schools can't do this alone. They must work in partnership with their communities. Schools are imbedded in the culture of the community. The two are interdependent.

John Dewey once said that the whole community must want for its schools what the best and wisest parent wants for his or her own child. To achieve that ideal today, schools must overcome learning barriers that reach far beyond the classroom -- the effects of changing family structures, escalating child poverty, violence, drugs, and teen pregnancy. Breaking through those barriers means joining forces with parents, business, elected officials, and social agencies under creative new collaborations.

Now I come to one of our most fundamental beliefs: Real change in schools does not come from outside the system. It begins with insiders. By this I don't mean that change must always be bottom-up. There is a place for both top-down and bottom-up leadership. Whether you see today's schools as promising institutions, or you think schools need to be entirely reinvented, you can't reach your vision by ignoring the wisdom and commitment of practitioners.

Decisions about school reform require the involvement of teachers, principals, parents, and local superintendents. These people give us the wisdom of practice. Teachers and administrators are partners in educational R&D, not merely recipients of it. We capture their insights and experience so that other practitioners can profit from it. And they, in turn, become our respected and treasured colleagues, not pawns to be manipulated.

One last belief I want to mention is almost a given in the current educational reform context: We believe that schools need comprehensive, systemic change. There's pretty wide agreement -- no matter what your ideology -- that we need to fundamentally rethink the way we organize and operate schools.

A systemic orientation means realizing and taking advantage of the fact that change in one part of the system necessarily affects every other part of the system.

As we master system dynamics and seek interventions that will give us the greatest leverage, we must never lose sight of our purposes. We have to keep asking, what need do children have for this change.

We must give highest priority to local flexibility. Teachers and principals must have the training, the leeway, and the resources to initiate reforms for purposes dictated by their communities.

These are the beliefs to which our members hold firm, Mr. Chairman. There is a great deal in H.R. 4014, the "Education Research, Development, and Dissemination Excellence Act," to indicate that we and this subcommittee are guided by the same core beliefs and the same vision for schools. To achieve our vision, we need a stable federal infrastructure for education research and development.

H.R. 4014 does this by addressing the five functions of federal education research and development programs -- research, development, dissemination, technical assistance, and the establishment of information and reference systems. H.R. 4014 also requires that these functions come together in a truly coordinated system.

Many of our views on H.R. 4014 have been communicated to this subcommittee previously. My comments today are on the second draft of the bill that was shared with us last week.

We like the modifications you have made in this draft.

- We like that the governing board in this infrastructure is highly accountable to Congress. In addition, you have resolved the constitutional problems we raised earlier with this subcommittee.

• We support public standards-setting as an appropriate role for the Board.

• We welcome the open process through which the Office of Educational Research and Improvement will meet its legitimate needs for high quality scientific and technical staff.

• We like that you have considerably simplified and strengthened the advisory system for the various components of the R&D infrastructure.

• We delight that you have recognized this nation's need for long-term programmatic research by maintaining research centers. The success of development, dissemination, and technical assistance depends on the work of these enduring research institutions. No one has more depth and made a bigger contribution in assessment than the Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing at UCLA. Similarly, no one has a better understanding of how schools affect disadvantaged kids than the caring people at the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students at Johns Hopkins University.

I know that some would have you believe that the endurance of these institutions presents a problem. Just the opposite is true. Some of the major obstacles in research and development have been the constant churning with which these institutions have had to live and the lack of resolve in the federal R&D system.

• Moreover, we like the coordination that H.R. 4014 requires of the regional educational laboratories and the National Diffusion Network. We have wanted to forge closer ties between these two groups for a long time.

• We agree that regional educational laboratories should work on the research priorities listed in H.R. 4014. These are: (1) the education of at-risk students; (2) the education and development of

58-581 O - 92 - 3

young children; (3) student achievement in core subject areas through elementary and secondary schooling; (4) literacy, post-secondary education, and lifelong learning for adults; and (5) the improvement of schools through the restructuring and reform of school governance, policymaking, finance and management at the state, local, school building, and classroom level.

Just let me add here, Mr. Chairman, that you have filled an important gap by broadening the research to include lifelong learning and literacy.

In the few minutes I have remaining to address this subcommittee, I am going to focus on areas which, in our view, would strengthen H.R. 4014 even more.

First, we urge you to remain steadfast in your decision to provide for research centers. In fact, we suggest that you set aside at least one-third of each Institute's funding for long-term, programmatic research conducted at these centers.

Second, we recommend that 10 percent of each Institute's funding be devoted to field initiated studies.

Third, we would like this subcommittee to more thoroughly define the role of "development." It is fairly easy to call for equity and educational improvement and to write these terms into legislation and research agendas. It is more difficult to get change down into schools.

Over the years, the words "research and development," or R&D, have become fused as if they were a single process. They are two separate processes. Both are critical and work in tandem. Occasionally we talk about research and dissemination and leave development out of the discussion altogether. This is just as wrong.

Although development builds on research, its purposes and methods are different. Research produces refined knowledge; development produces

usable products and human capital that is adapted to local situations. Research requires transformations, adaptations, or mixing with other knowledge before it can be used effectively. Development creates new alternatives that contribute to the improvement of educational practice.

Educational development takes many forms. These can usually be placed somewhere on a continuum with product development at one end and systemic change at the other. The product development approach focuses on creating materials, tools, or devices which, when used as directed, are reasonably certain to yield specified outcomes.

Emphasis is on creating the material means for improving educational practice. And, if systematically developed, these materials have been field tested, replicated in diverse settings, and validated as effective.

The systemic change approach attempts to change the structures, policies, operating procedures, and working environment of the organization, along with the attitudes, skills, motives, values, and shared visions of the people involved.

Systemic change strategies may be adapted to new situations, thereby reducing the amount of trial and error and thus the risks and costs. However, they are highly labor-intensive. Their justification is not in expectations for widespread replication but in their potential to achieve substantial restructuring at the chosen site.

Most educational development involves some mixture of these two approaches.

We seem have no trouble understanding the role of development in other fields. The development of the Scud-buster missile system is one example that comes to mind. But the role of development in school reform is seldom part of our considerations. Again, let me say that it needs to be.

Allow me to illustrate. One of the problems that research sometimes runs into is that it doesn't travel well. A program that works in one place can

lose its impact when implemented in another unless it is adjusted, tailored, and given the support it needs in its new setting. My colleagues at the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory found this out when they transported their very successful reading program from rural to urban settings. Moreover, they found that it wasn't just the program that had to be adjusted. The people who delivered it to urban schools had to be different than the people who delivered it to rural schools.

The human element is the key in development. A school district may hear about a program through dissemination, but once a lab is involved, development enters the picture. In development, you don't just take an idea and impose it. You work with the people who are taking the risk. Where I come from, we have a word for this. We call it "respect."

Here is another example of why development -- particularly development that responds to local and state practitioners' needs -- is critical. Helping schools confront the growing problem of hate crime is not a priority on the federal government's educational research and development agenda -- but it's a priority on the laboratories' agenda.

This is a copy of the *R&D Preview*. The *R&D Preview* is one vehicle that the laboratories use to disseminate research and development findings to practitioners and policymakers. Hate crime is featured in this magazine because it's a critical concern in our schools. While we certainly agree on the importance of our national educational goals, research and development must focus on much more. Otherwise, barriers will keep us from ever reaching those goals.

One barrier, for example, is the lack of trust in our public institutions. The role of R&D is to help public schools regain that trust. We can do that by marshalling our resources to solve problems that are important to the people working day in and day out with our young.

Another barrier is the impact of a surging poverty rate. The role of R&D is to develop ways to integrate the services that are available to children.

Along with this, we need to develop record-keeping and transfer systems so that as children move -- as children in poverty tend to do with frequency -- their records will follow them.

Another barrier is one that I mentioned a minute ago -- increasing racial tension. The role of R&D is to help schools incorporate multiculturalism in their instructional programs and in their everyday operations.

Still another barrier to change is the lack of community involvement in schools. Here the role of R&D is to design and test ways of getting parents and other community members involved.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, all of these problems are in addition to concerns about how to achieve national goals.

Finally, our fourth recommendation is really a plea. Mr. Chairman and members of this subcommittee, if you are going to place the regional educational laboratories into a dissemination component, please carefully define what you mean by that term. To us, dissemination means the transfer of ideas and products from their original sites to other sites. It includes planning, designing, and conducting activities that lead to the application of research and development in meeting educational needs. We have elaborated on this definition in our previous comments to you. We hope you will again consider them.

Mr. Chairman, once again, I thank you and the subcommittee and hope you will call on us if there is anything we can do to further your subcommittee's already very fine work.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Dr. Ann Lieberman.

Dr. LIEBERMAN. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee.

I feel privileged to be here, but I also feel like I have something to bring to this discussion. Not only am I President of AERA, but I have served on NDN committees, organized research, lab centers, done R&D, worked with teacher associations, and feel that I have a lot to bring to this discussion.

I have a statement that will be inserted in the record and I just want to speak to a few points.

I want to say first of all that AERA believes that the legislation that you're considering is vital not only to the interests of the 18,000 members of AERA, but to the Nation's capacity to improve its schools. We believe that the oversight hearings that you've been holding since 1988 show the hard work that this group has done and we think that this hearing represents yet another opportunity and challenge for you to try to reach consensus about Federal education research policy.

Our Governance and Professional Liaison Committee has been working on how to improve Federal education research for several years. We think there are three things that need sharpening and I just want to speak to those three things and three points of your legislation: greater stability, a sharper focus for educational research, and somehow dealing with attention to all three pieces of an effective program, research, development and dissemination, in much the same way that Preston Kronkosky has spoken about it.

Let me speak to the three things particularly in the bill that we think are very strong and that we want to laud. The first is the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board. We would like to say that the function of the board is essentially, we believe—and this is what we support and laud—to create a research plan or an agenda that ensures and assures that the agency conducts research, development and dissemination activities in accord with this plan, and that a major strength of the bill itself is the creation of such a board.

I think we can all argue about who ought to be on the board, but I think we agree that to find a consensus is worth struggling for and one that I think we need to continue to speak through.

I think it is true that although the present Assistant Secretary spoke in a little different vein, that many of us who have been around for a long time, in fact, know that there have been, even in this current time, two Presidents, three Secretaries of Education, and four Assistant Secretaries of Education. Some of us have been around a long time in the old NIE. In fact, in the old NIE there was a new Assistant Secretary every 18 months. It's no wonder that Congress feels dubious about educational research, practice, and dissemination. We think that the new board that you're proposing is critical to having some kind of stability, and we think the board is going to be in the best interest of OERI.

Second, let me speak to the National Research Institutes which we think are an important part of the discussion. Many of my colleagues and I have worked with many of them in the centers and in the laboratories, and we think they have done well, and also

have been underfunded. We think that the centers ought to continue to operate as significant and substantial components. But it is very important to begin to talk about particular educational problems that are not going to go away even in 5 years, which is the center's life, or the laboratory's life. But these are problems that resist quick and dirty and easy solutions, and the kinds of institutes that we think you've been talking about are going to be extremely important not only because they represent problems that are of an enduring quality, but they will give a flexibility. A center has a mission and it has to stick to it for 5 years. We think this will give you the flexibility to create not only enduring institutes but institutes that can come up as problems come up, which I think many of us have been walking through. I think many of us feel that there's almost a problem overload and we've got to figure out what those significant problems are and put our resources to work on them.

The last part is the part that I really know the most about, and that is the whole area of national educational dissemination, since that's an area that I've been working in my entire research life, 30 years, and I was a teacher before that, always trying to struggle to understand what research could really do for us as teachers.

I would like to say that our association has just initiated—we are just in the process of organizing it—an effort with the two teachers associations, designed specifically to promote a genuine exchange of perspectives on how research can improve practice and how practice can improve what the researchers look at and look for. We are very pleased that title III calls for additional study of effective dissemination strategies is part of your plan.

It is my own view that we have so underestimated the kind of work that is needed to really deal with getting knowledge into schools and having school people a part of creating that knowledge, that it's going to take not only study of dissemination strategies but careful work in understanding the forms and formats that are most properly going to be used to include what my colleague, Linda Darling Hammond, calls the creation of community of interest. In fact, we have new forms and formats that are far more powerful than any of the formal kinds of things that we've known before.

With the advent of networks, compacts, school/university partnerships, school/business partnerships, association partnerships of all kinds, we literally have no data on how these things work. We are growing up with a whole new way of thinking about how to document these kinds of partnerships to try to understand what it is that people do to make them work, how we really get knowledge both produced and used by people in the schools.

So I think, although I applaud your discussion and plan on education extension agents, I think it's good. But it's only a start. I assume that's the way you are looking at it. If Dr. Ravitch were here, I would tell her, too, that I think technology is fine. But I work in New York City and we don't even have computers in schools, much less dealing with data bases and the kinds of technology.

I think we've also got to deal with people strategies. They are long term, they are tough, and they're hard. But there's no way that we're actually going to organize some communities of interest to work on transforming schools—not just improving them—unless we begin to get far better at people strategies. Technology is fine, but it has got to be in the service of the organization of people.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ann Lieberman follows:]

American Educational
Research Association

RE: **H.R. 4014** - - - March 17, 1992

Testimony of **Dr. Ann Lieberman**, Teachers College, Columbia University, before the House Subcommittee on Select Education

Good Morning Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee.

Thank you for this opportunity to discuss the important topic of the future of federal education research programs. AERA believes the legislation you are considering is vital not only to the interests of the 18,000 members of our association, but to the Nation's capacity to improve its schools.

It is a special pleasure to work again with you, Chairman Owens. You addressed our Annual Meeting last year on topics central to this Bill, and this year you will be attending our meeting again to discuss the topic of the federal role in education research with Dr. Ravitch and some leading policy scholars.

Our staff informs me that oversight hearings were held by the Subcommittee in preparation for the present reauthorization of OERI as long ago as September, 1988. And I have been advised of the numerous hearings which have followed, as well as the procedures your staff has undertaken to gather opinions from a broad spectrum of the education community. This hearing represents yet another effort to involve the total community in reaching consensus about federal education research policy, and we are pleased to take part in this discussion.

WHAT IS OUR SITUATION?

I know of no indicator of consequence that bodes well for knowledge production in education if we continue on our present course.

* Resources are totally inadequate. Two GAO studies have chronicled the decline in federal support since 1980 -- a period during which most other federal research programs experienced substantial growth -- but they do not adequately address the culture of poverty that pervades education research. There are fewer dollars available for federal research in education today, disregarding inflation (!), than there were in 1974.

1230 14th Street, N.W. • Washington, DC 20 (0)376 • 202) 223-9485
Fax (202) 775-1824

* The infrastructure is in disrepair. Universities are unable to support young scholars in the field of education research. While much progress has been made with regard to recruitment and training of women scholars, we are failing to attract minority researchers. AERA has set aside $750,000 of its own funds to support minority graduate students as its contribution to this problem. Much more will be required.

* Virtually no money is available for individual scholars seeking to conduct educational research. The total funds available to support investigations into critical problems by individual scholars (i.e., field-initiated research) in 1992 is less than $1 million dollars.

* The Nation does not have the knowledge base required to support reforms of the magnitude it wishes to make. Members of the Subcommittee will be familiar with the catalog of well-intended reforms that have disappointed educators and the public. Successful education reforms must be grounded in solid understanding of learning, teaching, and schooling.

As you know, the National Academy of Education recently released a report on the condition of education research. They concluded that adequate support for education research required contributions from corporations, foundations, and the universities. However, the Academy noted that the federal government must accept primary responsibility for support of education research in the Nation, and that it was not meeting its responsibility. They challenged the government to invest much more and to invest in research programs which provided sustained attention to major education problems.

The National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences will shortly release its own two-year study of the federal program of education research, with particular emphasis on OERI. We do not know what this body will recommend. However, the existence of these two major reports indicates clearly that this is a time of ferment regarding the governance and financing of education research. I believe that the legislation being proposed by this subcommittee is central to improving the knowledge base available to educators and policy makers.

WHAT IS REQUIRED TO IMPROVE THE FEDERAL EDUCATION RESEARCH PROGRAM?

Our Government and Professional Liaison Committee has been working on the question of how to improve the federal education research program for several years. They have concluded that the program requires greater stability, sharper focus, and, attention to all three pieces of an effective program: research, development, and dissemination. These topics have been addressed constructively in the central provisions of H.R. 4014, and I will discuss them in the context of the Bill.

(A) The National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board

Title II of the Bill provides for a National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board. The function of the Board is essentially to create a research plan or agenda and to assure that the agency conducts research, development, and dissemination activities in accord with this plan. We believe this is an essential element of a successful federal education research program and that a major strength of the present Bill is the creation of such a Board.

Since this Committee began hearings in preparation for the reauthorization of OERI in 1988, the agency has sought to serve the policies of two Presidents, three Secretaries of Education, and four Assistant Secretaries of Education. Its predecessor, NIE, was buffeted by plans to eliminate it, to turn it into a foundation, and to have its research agenda converted to partisan political issues. Beginning with the creation of NIE it is estimated that there has been a new Assistant Secretary in charge of the Nation's research program every 18 months.

There have been many outstanding Assistant Secretaries in charge of federal education research programs. But irrespective of their individual strengths, Congress has proven unwilling to provide adequate support for education research programs that change direction frequently, and that appear closely tied to priorities established by an Administration rather than by the broader education community.

While AERA believes additional improvements can yet be made in the proposed National Board, such a board is in the best interests of OERI and the future of education research. One litmus test for creation of such a board is whether or not one would want to work under such circumstances oneself; we believe a Board of the type proposed would permit accomplishment of an outstanding education research program.

(B) The National Research Institutes

Many of my colleagues provide outstanding research through the Education Research and Development Centers, a vehicle that has served education well for many years. It is my understanding that present Centers will be assured of continuation through the end of their contract periods. Most importantly, Centers will continue to operate as significant and substantial components of the proposed Institutes.

Centers have successfully captured the imagination and dedication of creative scholars in the field and in the agency. However, reliance totally on the center concept has precluded mobilization of substantial resources toward comprehensive and sustained research strategies needed to resolve enduring education problems. We believe that for research to assist in the resolution of problems such as the effective education of at-risk students requires identification of missions, comprehensive research strategies, and much greater financial support than has been available to the research centers. AERA has proposed creation of

several $50 million institutes rather than many $1 or $2 million centers.

It is our hope that, ultimately, institutes will be created through a process such as provided for by the National Policy Board to meet needs as they emerge. Consequently, while some might argue for one or another institute as most important at the moment, we agree with the Committee that what is essential is provision of a structure that will permit growth and change as circumstances dictate.

(C) National Education Dissemination

H.R. 4014 calls attention to a major problem within the education community and one in which I have had a long-standing interest. The best research is of little consequence if it does not influence practice ultimately. Our Association has initiated an effort with the two teacher associations designed to promote a genuine exchange of perspectives on research for improved practice.

We are especially pleased that Title III calls for additional study of effective dissemination strategies. It is my own view that we have so under-estimated the difficulty of effective dissemination that we will be staggered to find what is required to effectively transmit knowledge into usable practice. Dissemination can not be a stand-alone activity, no matter how sophisticated the technology involved. It requires research and development and training; it requires intensive collaboration between researchers and practitioners about the ways and means of translating research into practice.

Research, development, and dissemination are the three essential pieces of improved practice and improved schools. H.R. 4014 addresses each in a bold and imaginative fashion and we commend the Subcommittee for its work in producing such a vision.

I will be pleased to respond to any questions from Members of the Subcommittee, or from my colleagues.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. I want to thank all of you for your testimony and for the fact that you have submitted written comments before and helped us along the way in the process of developing H.R. 4014.

As you state, Dr. Lieberman, the problem overload is great, when you consider the fact that there's been massive disinvestment, where the budget of OERI now, in real dollar terms, 15 percent less than it was in 1980. But I want to thank you, Dr. Wise, for pointing out that it is only 15 or 20 percent of the budget of 1973. It shows how far backwards we have gone. It is quite unfortunate, and I do hope that H.R. 4014 will be supported and can represent a new beginning.

The most political thing that has happened is quite obvious; the most partisan political thing that's happened to education research and development is this massive disinvestment. Also related to that is the fact that we've played musical chairs with directors and personnel. It is clear that a stabilizing process is needed. We know of no better stabilizing process than the board that we are proposing. It will not end partisan politics. We can only minimize it. We are a partisan government, a partisan Nation. We seek to minimize partisan politics and to maximize at least a bipartisan approach. Hopefully we can get to the stage one day where there will be a nonpartisan approach to education research and development.

I don't have any questions. I wondered if any of you had further comments you would like to make.

I will yield to Mr. Ballenger.

Mr. BALLENGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm sorry to be impolite in listening. Having only been in Congress 6 years, I was trying to find out when was the founding of the OERI, the Department of Education? I just wondered if that had anything to do with—really, this is not a negative question. It's just a lack of knowledge on my part.

Dr. WISE. In 1979.

Mr. BALLENGER. In 1979. And the funding that we were talking about earlier was in 1973.

Dr. WISE. Yes.

Mr. BALLENGER. In other words, this doesn't sound like Washington. It sounds like something strange. And the fact that once it became a division of the Department, it got less funding?

Dr. WISE. Actually, it—well, of course, the National Institute of Education was originally a separate agency created in 1972. It started out with a budget of around $125 million. Almost immediately it began a decline from that level. It regularly declined almost every year from 1973 on, and the creation of the Department was almost incidental to that. It just kind of continued on its predetermined course.

Mr. BALLENGER. Thank you. A little education here.

I would like to ask Dr. Lieberman, being from North Carolina and not really knowing much about the school situation in New York, until I read a Reader's Digest article—did you see that article about the way they fund the people that work in the school system? It seems to me that research and development is not going to do a great deal of good when you're paying a man $57,000 to

mop the floor three times a year. I just cannot rationalize how you do that. Do you have any ideas?

I just wonder, do the unions really run the schools?

Dr. LIEBERMAN. I think the unions in New York City are very heavily involved in school improvement, and I work with them. I think that you have to look at—virtually every association that's involved with education is in the process of transforming itself. Our own association is trying really hard to think differently about how research can really effect and influence people. People are trying new ways to do this.

I think the unions are another example. They are also working in some very significant ways, in collaborative ways as well, not only in New York but in other places, too. So everyone is involved in this change process, not just the researchers. I think we have to sort of guard against the old stereotypes we have.

Mr. BALLENGER. Like I say, all I know about is what I read in the Reader's Digest. Obviously, it's not always the open-ended side of things.

In fact, North Carolina has a very interesting thing itself, a center for the advancement of teaching, I believe, which is a new collaboration. It's been very successful.

In fact—and I'm not bragging—but I think it was a bipartisan effort on our part to start off the school in math and science. They have done a fabulous job. And I was always one of the ones that was trying to make them pay tuition, which everyone said I shouldn't do that. My next-door neighbor happened to be a lawyer that was making $250,000 a year, and his child went to the school of math and science with free tuition. I just thought that, you know, somewhere along the line, if he really loved it that much, he ought to be willing to pay a little bit for it. But somehow they shot me down every time I tried to discuss that point.

Dr. LIEBERMAN. I think one of the things that's happened over the years is that research has been separated from dissemination. They need to work together. Research, development and dissemination are pieces of a whole; they're not separate entities. I think that's part of what our own association is working on.

Mr. BALLENGER. It appears to me that the effort of this bill is very much needed as far as I can tell. I realize we have some differences as far as the administration is concerned, and I hope it doesn't damage the whole idea. But the basic idea of upgrading the education of our kids in school, as far as I'm concerned, is one of the most important things that I, as a Congressman, could have anything to do with. I appreciate all the effort that you all have put into it.

I really don't have any serious questions because I'm not that theoretical that I could understand what you all are talking about. I do appreciate very much you all coming. Thank you.

Dr. LIEBERMAN. Thank you.

Chairman OWENS. Just one point of personal privilege.

The Institute on Governance I hope will help to get the Federal Government involved in combating corruption and excesses in school boards and school districts. With reference to the custodian's contract that you mentioned, while they are required to do strange things for a considerable amount of money, that is one of the evils

that a number of people like me have been fighting for years. In the New York City system, we could use some leverage from a Federal Government that threatens to condition its grants and its resources for help on improvements in highly charged political arrangements like the custodian's contract. It's an example of partisan politics interfering with education that is completely out of hand. I hope the Institute on Governance will address that issue.

This is not unique to New York City. School boards across the country are hampered by patronage systems, unions which have too much power, sometimes businesses that have too much power, et cetera. That is a concern we must address.

I have just a few questions that I was going to try not to ask, but I think I will have to for the record.

Dr. Kronkosky, how do the labs see the proposal for learning grant institutions and district education agents? Can you give me a candid, forthright answer on that?

Dr. KRONKOSKY. I think we're very excited about them, sir. I think it represents a real breakthrough. I think it has great possibilities. We hope that that portion of the bill survives.

Chairman OWENS. Do you see any danger to the existence of the labs in that proposal?

Dr. KRONKOSKY. I don't think so, sir. We are supported by the American taxpayers. We want to be sure that we do good work for every dollar that we are awarded, et cetera. We competitively bid for our contracts and grants. We are visited or evaluated almost every year of our 25½ years of existence. We have been winnowed down from 20 originally to six remaining, and a seventh that is no longer an official regional education laboratory. We think we have been tested in the fires of reality and we welcome this opportunity with our new brethren that make the ten and we believe we have a contribution to make. We look forward to that portion of H.R. 4014.

Chairman OWENS. Is it clear from the language of the bill that any laboratory could become a learning grant institution; that any center could become a learning grant institution?

Dr. KRONKOSKY. It was clear to me.

Chairman OWENS. I just want it for the record because it seems not to be clear to some people. We think the language is quite clear, that that possibility is there.

Dr. KRONKOSKY. It's not guaranteed, of course.

Chairman OWENS. No, it's not guaranteed, but a lab could——

Dr. KRONKOSKY. There appears to be an opportunity for us, at least that's the way I read it.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Dr. Wise, this committee also is responsible for programs related to children with disabilities and we want to clarify something here.

You state that the research by the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research has had a positive impact on the way we educate students with disabilities. Would you care to elaborate on that a little bit and give us some examples?

Dr. WISE. Well, I believe it is the case that that institute has been around for a number of years now and it has operated at an appropriate scale, I believe now in the vicinity of $57 million a year. This institute focuses on a clear target, children with disabil-

ities, and has made a major difference in the way that we approach the education of such youngsters.

Indeed, in a report by Assistant Secretary Ravitch, released by the National Academy of Education, the impact of that institute and of the research and development conducted by that institute on the education of children with disabilities was singled out as one of the most remarkable success stories of how serious and sustained educational research, development and dissemination, focused on a particular area, can in fact make a giant difference in the way that schools actually approach these youngsters.

I think it's a model for the creation of other institutes operating at a similar scale and over a sustained period of time. I believe that were we to invest significantly in the education of at-risk youngsters, we would see over the next 5 to 10 years major changes in the way the schools operate in relation to these youngsters.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. We need examples like that because we are still being asked the question—by colleagues and people who should know better—what will all of these entities in this bill do? What will all these institutes do, with the centers and the labs? Is there enough work out there? They're not aware of the problem overload at all. We have to spell out in great detail, I think, what this problem overload is.

People who have not hesitated to devote a tremendous amount of dollars for research and development in the area of defense and agriculture can't see that there are problems in education which merit the kind of structure that we're proposing.

Dr. Linn, I suspect your services and the services of your center have been much in demand recently. As we said, we see a highly charged, rapidly escalating drive to get assessment in place as rapidly as possible—and we fear for the wrong reasons. What are some of the dangers that you see that we can use research and development to avoid?

Dr. LINN. Well, I think that the expectations in many cases are outrunning the realities in terms of how fast things can be put into place and how great the impact can be, without worrying about some of the downsides.

I think it's important for research that is conducted in this area to provide assurance with regard to some of the negative and unintended side effects that creep into systems when they get put into place. Our center has done that kind of research for a number of years on programs in the past. The ones that are being proposed differ primarily in the nature of the types of assessments that are being introduced, switching more to the open-ended problems, portfolios of work and the like. Some of the same issues need to be addressed in the research to assure that you can avoid some of the mistakes of the past.

Chairman OWENS. Do you find that there are certain forces out there which don't always want objectivity and the high standards of research and science to be applied as they seek answers to the particular kinds of problems that they pose?

Dr. LINN. There are at times, indeed. There are, as in any area, people that are promising more than there's a basis to support in many cases, I think. To do research that would question that, obviously underlines agendas that people may have in mind when they

try to implement a system based upon promises as opposed to any real evidence.

Chairman OWENS. We have found, from information we've received in the last few weeks, that there is a problem of some people feeling that they've been intimidated by certain kinds of questions that are being asked and issues raised from Washington. I think it's important to note that this committee is interested in any information about such actions and certainly will act quickly to deal with them.

I want to thank you all again for your testimony.

Panel III consists of Dr. Tom Schultz, Director, Early Childhood Services, National Association of State Boards of Education, Alexandria, VA; Mr. Ed Keller, Deputy Executive Director, National Association of Elementary School Principals, also from Alexandria; and Dr. Wornie Reed, Director of the Urban Child Research Center, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH. Please take your seats.

This panel has been patiently waiting and we would not like to keep them waiting much longer. So, we would appreciate those people who are leaving to go quietly and quickly.

We will begin with Dr. Schultz.

STATEMENTS OF THOMAS SCHULTZ, DIRECTOR OF EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION; EDWARD P. KELLER, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS; AND WORNIE L. REED, DIRECTOR, URBAN CHILD RESEARCH CENTER, CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Dr. SCHULTZ. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ballenger. I am pleased to appear to talk with you today on behalf of the National Association of State Boards of Education which represents more than 600 board members and States and territories across the country.

I have submitted some prepared remarks in writing and I would like to give some highlights of that. But before highlighting some of my prepared comments, I wanted to offer a somewhat optimistic observation about the dialogue thus far this morning and about the key features of your bill.

It strikes me as quite an achievement of creativity and consensus building, that there is a lot of consensus among all the witnesses about the need for an overall governance body that would set long-term priorities for the agency. The squabbling is over what number of members and how they should be selected, but it seems to me that's a structural change that people have all said would be a plus.

Secondly, I have heard only positive endorsement for the structure of a research institute strategy, for the research that's carried out through OERI, and for the substantive priorities in the areas such as early childhood, postsecondary, disadvantaged students, et cetera. Again, it's remarkable that such a diverse group of witnesses would be in agreement about that.

Similarly, it seems to me there's agreement, both from the administration and in your proposal, that in the area of dissemination there's a need to build better connections among the pieces that are already in place at OERI, and also to try something new. I think there's a slight difference of opinion about whether that should be more a technology-oriented new strategy, such as this education line, or the human development approach that you've taken in the learning grant institutions and district education agents. But, I guess, as an optimist, I would start off by saying we really have agreement about major elements in a blueprint to improve the Federal role in R&D. That is certainly the interest of our members. Whenever we talk with them about Federal policy issues, there are lots of issues of contention where they are not sure or they're not in agreement about what should be done or whether more should be done. There is always consensus when we bring up the issues of research, development, and dissemination, that they would like to see more; they would like to know more about what is being done. I think their image of OERI is somewhat pale, that they recognize it's out there but they don't feel as intimately informed about it as they would like to be.

Let me move on to talk about one major observation about each of the structural features of your bill. Since there was such a long dispute or discussion about the selection of members for the national board, I would at least comment on that as a representative of a national organization.

My view is that the method that you have proposed would be helpful to OERI because it would increase the sense of awareness and connections among the many education organizations around the country that it's seeking to influence and improve and support. I would say, speaking on our behalf, that we recognize new language in the revised bill that would prohibit an officer or board member or staff member of the organization being chosen as a representative to that board, and we assume there would be other appropriate conflict of interest provisions that would be added.

I think, as well, that my own observation is that if you would ask us to nominate a State board member, we would be nominating a lay person who already spends three or four days of their month going to meetings on an unpaid basis, listening to experts trying to give advice and make wise decisions, and that would be the kind of person that would be coming to the OERI board. I don't think their motivation would be to seek grants and contracts on behalf of our organization.

Let me move on to the research institute strategy. I think there's been little commentary about that. Frankly, I'm very excited about the vision that that would provide for more visible, thematic, long-term investments on key issues. My own work over the past 5 years at NASBE has been in the area of early childhood and I would recognize tremendous potential for Federal leadership in that area of practice and policy. I'm sure you're aware that the growth of early childhood programs at the State and Federal levels has been driven by evaluation and research, but there is very little Federal investment in funding basic research on how young children learn and develop in the context of families and communities, or on key policy issues.

If a State legislator or a State board member wanted to find out what's going on in terms of State funding for preschool and child care programs, they would have to call the Children's Defense Fund. They wouldn't be able to call the U.S. Department of Education. So I think there's tremendous opportunity for the kind of long-term institute that you've laid out here, and I think that the issue of early childhood is a good example of that.

To turn to the dissemination strategy, I think that there is, in my mind, great positive value in drawing together the pieces within OERI that I think have been doing hard and difficult work, often without a lot of resources. I think centering the function of this collaborative work around identifying and publicizing exemplary and promising programs is a good fit to the different capabilities of those systems.

The point that I would like to make is that it is not enough to simply have our efforts and resources focused on having a bigger catalog of promising improvement programs. As you know, Mr. Chairman, we have in the National Diffusion Network already a catalog of some 400 innovative programs that have gone through a review process that I'm involved in at present. I think having a larger catalog, or having a catalog that also includes promising programs, or having a catalog that's on a computer that's in each school, is important and would be a plus, but it's not all that's needed.

As I stressed in my testimony, I think what we also have to address is investment in new strategies and structures, to help researchers and practitioners get from the stage of an exciting finding on the research front, or an innovative idea in the classroom, into a form that can be helpful to people in other places, and that also can be evaluated for its potential. Right now there is not a lot of opportunity, particularly for practitioners, to get support for that kind of activity. It is time-consuming and expensive. So I think that finding some ways to think through what would be ways to get more resources and more acknowledgment of the need to invest in the development side of things is critical, in my view.

Similarly, I think that we found, through the National Diffusion Network, that simply making people understand that these innovative or proven programs are available is not sufficient to get them installed or to help teachers figure out how to use them in their own individual situation. I think there needs to be much more resources given to sustained training and professional development and follow up. I think giving a one-shot training session or an awareness session on a program will get people excited, but if we want them to change the way they work with children or with parents, or we want to change the way school administrators operate day to day, we have got to provide much more sustained support for training and for support through that process of implementation.

So those are the comments that I would share with you. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Thomas Schultz follows:]

Dr. Thomas Schultz, Director of Early Childhood Services

Chairman Owens and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to be here to discuss H.R. 4014, the Educational Research, Development, and Dissemination Excellence Act. I am Tom Schultz, from the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), which represents over 600 members of state and territorial boards of education. I should disclose that I worked for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) and its predecessor agency the National Institute of Education (NIE) from 1978 to 1986; I currently direct a study of innovative early childhood programs funded by OERI; and I serve as Chair of the Program Effectiveness Panel, which reviews the effectiveness of programs for OERI's National Diffusion Network.

H.R. 4014 proposes three major changes in structure and strategy for OERI:

- The National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board

- The National Research Institutes Strategy

- The National Education Dissemination System

I will comment on these proposals based on the historical context of federal R&D in education. In my view, OERI has struggled with three eternal challenges:

- Inadequate funding to support balanced, substantial investments in research, development and dissemination.

- Lack of a sizeable constituency for federal leadership in R&D, beyond the groups and individuals already receiving funding from OERI.

- Frustrations with the limited impact of research on teaching, learning and schooling.

These problems aren't easy to solve. Research management is inherently uncertain. Unlike grocery shopping where we can inspect the produce and pick out the most attractive items, we pay for research before we know how it will turn out. As Lewis Thomas reminds us:

> "In real life, research is dependent on the human capacity for making predictions that are wrong, and on the even more human gift for bouncing back to try again. This is the way the work goes. The predictions, especially the really important ones that turn out, from time to time, to be correct, are pure guesses. Error is the mode."

Similarly, applying the wisdom of research to thousands of classrooms and policy situations is fraught with logistical and social difficulties.

The National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board

Few administrators welcome the creation of external policy boards. However, smart administrators learn how to use oversight groups as advocates for their agencies. While OERI makes extensive use of peer reviewers and advisors for specific programs, it has no governance group which looks across all its activities and plans for its future. We believe a stable, broadly-composed, policy board would strengthen OERI in several ways:

- An external policy group can enhance the credibility of major decisions on priorities. For example, it's not obvious how to choose between proposals to create research institutes on early childhood and at-risk students, or to fund states to create standards for student achievement and curriculum content; to create SMARTLINE or to expand the National Diffusion Network. When technical choices are hard to resolve, suspicions of political influence can easily arise. The history of OERI and NIE shows that even a few instances of inappropriate ideological influence in decisions can hurt the agency's reputation for years. Working through the proposed Board to set long-term priorities would also reduce concerns raised by turnover in OERI management; I worked for seven different Directors or Assistant Secretaries during my eight years at the agency.

- Using national organizations to nominate members for the Board would help improve OERI's ties with important constituencies. National associations are major conduits for information, technical assistance and networking for educators and policymakers. Including representatives of a wide range of organizations on the Board would increase their awareness of OERI's work and their support for new initiatives.

- The proposed Board of scholars and practitioners would provide an excellent forum for designing better dissemination strategies. Practitioners can describe their current and future concerns (helping define the market or appetites which disseminators should respond to) and serve as a sounding board on questions of strategy (will teachers use a computerized data base on exemplary practices? what forums or publications attract the attention of key policymakers?). Researchers can contribute insights on the most promising or surprising findings emerging from research in progress, and from studies of school improvement, program implementation, and professional development. It's the combination of these bodies of information and experience which are needed in rethinking how to make research more useful to teachers, managers and decisionmakers.

The National Research Institutes Strategy

This proposal would create a set of visible thematic, mission-driven entities to frame long-term programs of R&D around core problems and report to the nation on progress over time. As with any proposed thematic structure, questions can be raised about overlap across the mission areas, and on how Institutes will work to coordinate dissemination to common audiences. However, the Institute strategy is an attractive, symbolic fresh start for the research function.

A key strength of this structure is its potential to broaden OERI's constituency. For example, a Research Institute on Early Childhood could provide useful leadership for a growing field of scholarship and services. While expansion of early childhood programs has been driven by a few notable evaluation studies, there has been little federal support for research on early childhood and family policy issues, nor on the processes of learning and development in young children. Studies are being funded by foundations and different federal agencies without an overall agenda or means to cumulate or synthesize findings on key questions. Beyond the ERIC Center on early childhood issues, OERI has no point of connection with the large and growing community of early childhood teachers and program directors. Policymakers seeking information about state preschool and child care programs find answers at Children's Defense Fund rather than the U.S. Department of Education. Thus an Institute in this area would provide a focal point for scholarship and an outreach to a substantial new audience for OERI.

The National Education Dissemination System

This proposal offers the strength of building some new connections among the many different dissemination programs at OERI around the function of identifying and disseminating promising and exemplary programs. It also creates a new program to target resources to needy urban and rural communities for planning around the national education goals and applying research to improve schools.

Our misgiving is that too much attention and resources are devoted to the task certifying and publicizing promising and exemplary practices. These plans fail to acknowledge sizeable challenges which precede and follow this function:

- We need to give more structure and resources for the development, refinement and evaluation of exemplary/promising programs/practices. What support is available to move new findings or insights from research into the form of programs, materials or training strategies? Where can local teachers go if they have a new idea or innovation which lacks the form necessary for evaluation or for adoption by colleagues in other settings? A major weakness with the present NDN system is that candidate projects lack the expertise and funds to evaluate and present their merits/effectiveness.

- Similarly, we know that helping teachers implement a new program requires sustained training, monitoring and adaptation to different local conditions. If all we do is publicize a catalogue or computer directory of innovations and provide one-shot training sessions, we won't realize the potential of innovative strategies. If we want to actually improve teaching and school practices, we need a substantial new investment in training, monitoring and followup support.

The proposed America 2000 Communities strategy has real appeal in terms of concentrating resources in needy communities which may not be well served by other current dissemination programs. The Learning Grant Institutions and District Education Agents offer the potential to stimulate new connections among local schools and the many other public agencies and neighborhood organizations which influence children's learning and development. However, we are concerned that this strategy is insufficiently connected to the school boards and administrators who set policies on curriculum, testing and professional development for schools. We believe that school improvement and staff development initiatives from DEAs and LGAs must be meshed into a coherent system of supports and incentives for local teachers and principals.

In summary, we see great potential in the structural and programmatic provisions of this legislation. Real improvements in federal research leadership also depend on steady, substantial growth in financial resources. We are encouraged by the recent example of progress in reshaping and expanding investment in the National Center for Education Statistics. Hopefully, this reauthorization will set the stage for a similar expansion in basic and applied research and in systems to bring research to bear on the urgent challenge of improving the education and development of all our children and young people.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Mr. Ed Keller.

Mr. KELLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ballenger.

I represent the National Association of Elementary School Principals, a national organization representing over 26,000 elementary and middle school principals. Our association focuses on children, principals, and the principalship. We are pleased to have been invited to testify before your committee on H.R. 4014, the Educational Research, Development, and Dissemination Excellence Act.

In the interest of brevity and the hour, let me summarize my written testimony.

Elementary and middle school principals are very practice-oriented. They want to be able to translate research and development findings into improved instruction in the classroom and improved leadership in their school communities. It is an attitude of "What can I do Monday morning with my students, staff and parents" that drives them.

The order of presentation of this panel is indicative of the role of the principal. We're right in the middle. We serve in many, many ways as a key connecting link for a variety of agencies, a variety of services. That's why we're very pleased to be here and to indicate to you that there are a number of aspects of H.R. 4014 which make it particularly appealing to elementary and middle school principals.

The first is practitioner involvement. Opportunities are offered for membership on the Policy and Priorities Board, on subcommittees, review panels, and other advisory capacities. There are many distinguished practitioners among the various organizations who could ably serve as board members.

Coordination is emphasized throughout the bill, from the board, to subcommittee, the Federal agencies, to State and local governments, to local community planning. All aspects of governance and service delivery are expected to be coordinated.

The four institutes in H.R. 4014 are well-focused. They are directed toward areas that need extensive research and development if America is to move vigorously forward in improving education now and into the 21st century. For principals, the highlight of the bill is its emphasis on dissemination. We need more and better information about what programs are most effective, with which groups of children. Principals want all the tools they can muster to help make positive differences in children's lives. This bill can potentially give them many more of those tools.

The America 2000 communities program involves both dissemination and coordination. An interesting feature of the program is the creation of a district education agent. A full-time executor who can help a community rejuvenate its education program, an individual who can locate relevant research and development activities, who can coordinate all local and State resources to the needs of children, and who can provide continued technical assistance to those carrying out the plan, is greatly needed.

The creation of the DEA is a forward-thinking proposal, one that should be closely observed and evaluated. While the DEA provides technical assistance to others, he or she should also receive regular continued training. With any new position, there will be growing

pains, new processes discovered, and unanticipated challenges to be met and shared. Let's give this bold experiment a chance to succeed.

Mr. Chairman, the value you place on dissemination, coordination and participation clearly demonstrates your commitment to America's children and youth. We welcome your commitment and share with you our hope that H.R. 4014 is enacted this session.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Edward P. Keller follows:]

STATEMENT OF EDWARD P. KELLER, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) is pleased to offer testimony in support of H.R. 4014, the "Educational Research, Development, and Dissemination Excellence Act." The proposed legislation is a philosophical redirection of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) toward a significant and hopefully substantial research, development, and dissemination agenda on national education goals and school reform. Its varied components from the research institutes to expanded dissemination, from improved coordination to field-based technical assistance offer great potential. These components will help in securing data and implementing practices that inform and improve educational opportunities for our Nation's children and youth.

Elementary and middle school principals are very practice-oriented. They want to be able to translate research and development findings into improved instruction in the classroom. It is an attitude of, "What can I do Monday morning with my students, staff, and parents" that drives them.

H.R. 4014 establishes the ways and means to make those Monday mornings a productive reality. Its components include the direction, involvement, collaboration, and assistance that will give elementary and middle school principals the tools they need to better serve their school communities.

With the creation of the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board, advice and counsel are made available to OERI to help set an apolitical agenda of research, development, and dissemination. Members of the Board represent a wide range of research developers and users who can collaboratively guide the productive use of OERI resources in a strategic planning process. We note, however, that one significant user is not included on the Board and would, therefore, recommend that the Board be increased to 21 members, to include an elementary, middle school, or secondary school principal. Recommendations for nominees could be secured from the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the National Association of Secondary School Principals, which represent the profession.

The Board is also directed to solicit recommendations from researchers, educators, parents, and others to assist in its deliberations. Practitioner involvement is essential to the successful selection and implementation of research and development. NAESP is pleased with the expanded role provided for practitioner involvement in H.R. 4014.

NAESP is pleased, also, with the bill's emphasis on coordination of research, development, and dissemination activities, both within the Department and the Federal Government. We anticipate that these elements will be implemented more successfully than in the past.

A recent report on the fiscal year 1993 Federal budget for mathematics and science reflects this concern. A report developed by an agency coalition chaired by Secretary of Energy Watkins stated that this is the FIRST TIME that all Federal math/science program descriptions have been assembled in one document. The Federal Interagency Council on Education has existed for over 20 years. Accordingly, we find past lack of interagency collaboration very disappointing. Something obviously needs to be done, and we hope this bill will do it.

Coordination is a key feature of the four Institutes proposed in this bill. The subcommittee structure—tying the Institutes closely to the Board, while allowing for additional practitioner involvement—is helpful. Requiring the Institutes to work together on issues of mutual interest also holds great promise for productive, useful results.

The missions defined for the four Institutes focus OERI on meeting the needs of schools as they move toward the 21st century. To assist at-risk students, for exam-

ple, the bill calls for research and development on educator training, parenting skills, the use of technology, and community service.

Two programs with which NAESP is closely aligned include community service as a significant component. We feel it is essential that involvement in community service projects begins at the elementary school level, so that the value of helping others is demonstrated early in life. Merely adding community service as a credit course in high school, with no prior foundation, does not build long-term involvement. Research and development need to be pursued on this relatively uninvestigated topic, one that we believe contributes substantially to a student's complete education.

OERI currently has a modest investment in research and development on ways to work with parents of at-risk children to help improve student achievement in school. More needs to be done and this bill offers that opportunity.

At-risk children are particularly affected by a lack of comprehensive health care and the kinds of home learning experiences that help prepare them for successful entry into school. Dr. Ernest Boyner, chair of the Readiness Task Force for the National Education Goals Panel, has prepared a document on this topic which he will present to the NEGP on March 27. We would encourage the committee to secure copies of Dr. Boyner's report. It is likely to set the direction for State activity on Goal One, Readiness for School, and provides recommendations that the committee may want to consider incorporating in its direction to the Early Childhood Institute.

NAESP activities toward the goal of school readiness include collaboration with the High Scope Foundation on publications and workshops, production of our own Early Childhood Guidelines for Administrators, production of the award-winning video and booklet production for parents, "The Little Things Make a Big Difference," and school-age child care workshops with Wellesley College.

Research and development activities of the Early Childhood Institute could shed a great deal of light on the selection of appropriate indicators for determining readiness for school, an issue that has been puzzling the Goals Panel since it began attempting to define those standards.

While we are getting children ready for school, we should be working at getting schools ready for children. The Institute for Innovation in Educational Governance, Finance, and Management creates an opportunity to identify, develop, and test innovative school management and governance practices. Examining approaches to systemic reform, coordinated services for children, and improved leadership skills for school administrators, holds great promise for bettering the educational environment for both students and school staffs.

NAESP would be pleased to share with the committee its accomplishments in educational leadership: the Administrator Diagnostic Inventory, the Certificate of Advanced Proficiencies program, "Proficiencies for Principals," and "Guidelines for the Preparation of Elementary and Middle Level Principals."

The National Institute on Student Achievement has the potential to identify, develop, and evaluate a range of instructional and classroom management practices which can lead to improved instruction for all children. From an examination of best practices in various content areas, to studies of the context in which learning takes place, the Institute addresses discovery and assessment of programs and practices that will make a positive difference for our children and youth.

But all of this important research and development would be for naught without the key ingredient—dissemination.

All of the contributions of the Institutes, all of the coordination of research and development envisioned in the earlier provisions of the bill, all of the hopes and dreams of students and schools who benefit from this reorganization, would by unrealized without the well-coordinated, well financed, and broadly conceived dissemination system called for in H.R. 4014.

Including education associations and networks as participants in the dissemination system is critical to its success. Many of us have worked with OERI in the past, cooperating in the publishing and distribution of documents, and in conducting workshops. There is, however, much more that needs to be done to make elementary and middle school principals aware of the many exemplary programs available, and to keep them updated on new developments. An electronic network will be of great assistance in this enterprise, especially as schools move rapidly toward more effective use of technology, for both instruction and management.

Identifying applicable research and then translating it into practice have always been important objectives for principals. Unfortunately, the many constraints on their time have not allowed them to do as much in these areas as they would like. A full-time District Education Agent would be a welcome addition in helping to serve these needs. Such support will afford schools and school districts an opportunity to

increase collaboration, improve coordination, and strengthen student and staff education.

NAESP encourages this innovative experiment and urges that it be thoroughly evaluated. While the DEA is providing technical assistance to a school community, the DEA may also benefit from some technical assistance. Training and continued assistance to the DEA's should not be overlooked and would prove valuable in ascertaining the successes and needs of this new delivery system.

In summary, then, the National Association of Elementary School Principals urges the enactment of H.R. 4014. Its strengths of increased practitioner involvement, coordination of governance and service delivery, Institute objectives, and a strong emphasis on dissemination make this bill an important contribution to a resurgence of increasing America's educational productivity.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Dr. Reed.

Dr. REED. Mr. Chairman, Representative Ballenger, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to comment on your bill that addresses some very critical issues in our society. I commend your special effort to establish a district agent education extension program as well as your general effort to bring a research and development focus to the education enterprise in this country.

Given the present condition of education and the problems confronting it, our society can ill afford to delay efforts toward solutions. Unless the challenge posed by the current state of urban education is met, crises of major proportion can be anticipated in the not distant future.

The costs of failing to address these problems successfully are staggering, especially when we consider the costs required by the juvenile court system, the penal system, and other social and mental health agencies which must cope with those individuals for whom education has failed. The wasted expenditure of valuable human and financial resources should not be tolerated.

We are asking a lot of education, perhaps too much. The educational system, or nonsystem, cannot do all we ask without our help. A significant part of the problem, and the reason I call it a "nonsystem," is that very point. There is no coordinated approach, especially across school districts. The proposed plan for a district agent education extension program is an important step in the right direction.

To demonstrate the nature of my support for this program, I will just briefly describe what I have in the written paper submitted. I will describe programs with which I am associated that are based on the land grant university model.

The urban public research universities of today share some of the same principal concepts of the original land grant program: to make higher education more accessible to the public, and to link teaching and research of the university to the community it serves. Just as the land grant colleges were created in the 1860's to implement agricultural reforms and to educate the industrial class, this new group of universities emerged in the 1960's to meet the educational needs of urban populations. They were given a special mandate to serve the communities of which they were a part. They shared all of the same characteristics as the older public, land grant research universities, but they have some additional characteristics. These included such things as having a distinct urban mission; an applied research and service program using the city as a laboratory; a sense of responsibility to urban constituents and a

curriculum which explores issues of urban diversity; and a sense of urgency to the need to address urban problems.

In recognition of their obvious mandate as urban universities, several of these schools organized themselves into a loose federation called the "Urban 13" to push for wider acceptance of their urban roles and for Federal and State funding to pursue this work. Cleveland State University, my current affiliation, as well as the University of Massachusetts at Boston, my former affiliation, are members of this Urban 13 coalition.

In the late 1970's, there were Federal-level attempts to build on the Morrill Act reforms and provide a focus and funding for urban universities and urban extension efforts. As a result of these efforts, Congress passed title XI, the Urban University Grant Program, as part of the 1980 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This program was designed to use the skills, talents, and knowledge of the Nation's urban universities toward the solution of urban problems. However, no funds were appropriated for this program. It seems that some might be coming now.

Although the Federal initiative for the development of a national urban university grant program did not obtain a national constituency, this concept was adopted in the State of Ohio. In 1979, the Ohio Board of Regents and the Ohio General Assembly approved a proposal from Cleveland State University to establish and fund a program, based on the land grant model, for urban-focused research and outreach activities at the State's universities located in the major urban centers. This action was taken in anticipation of the matching funds requirement of the proposed Federal legislation, which never came. Since the Federal funds never came, the Ohio urban university program remained relatively small.

Although it remained relatively small, the urban university program was quite successful. It was successful in providing research and technical assistance activities to urban areas that were designated, and it began to demonstrate the workings of an urban university model as being similar to the old land grant model. The Ohio Urban University Program links the resources of Ohio's academic institutions to the State's urban communities to solve some of the unique problems that we find in the cities.

The urban university program supports some eight State universities which serve urban areas of not less than 500,000 persons. It carries out a range of research, training, technical assistance and data base development activities. It has over a decade of experience with research and outreach activities, focused on program areas such as housing, neighborhood development, economic development, public management, and the Northern Ohio Data and Information Service.

The urban university model, as exemplified by Ohio, has the research expertise in urban issues but does not share the system of extension agents, nor multilevel public funding such as is found in the old land grant university model. But it seems to me that these are some situations that you're addressing with this bill, H.R. 4014.

A little more relevant to the issue here in education was the addition to the Ohio university program last year of something called the Urban Child Research Center at Cleveland State University. This is a center for the interdisciplinary study of education and the

urban child. In recognition of the university's urban mission for addressing the issues concerning the education of urban children and youth, this center was created in 1991 as a part of the State's urban university program, to have a focus on issues related to the education of urban children and youth, but also to realize that the research and technical assistance to educational programs and agencies had to be a little bit wider than just dealing directly with these agencies; that is to include other systems that affect the growth, development and education of children, including such things as the justice system and health and welfare.

I have just briefly gone over this idea of how the land grant model is being used in the State of Ohio as a means of showing my support for this proposed district agent education extension program, for two reasons. First, I wanted to show the context of my support; that is, the urban mission of these universities, the urban university programs in Ohio, all based on the old land grant model on which this district agent education extension program is based. The second reason for pointing this out is to make note that similar, though less comprehensive, efforts have been in development. So I would suggest there is some support out there, in places like Ohio, for the kind of efforts that you're proposing, this district agent effort. So I am strongly in support of these efforts because this is the kind of thing that I've been devoting a lot of attention to myself.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Wornie Reed follows:]

Wornie L. Reed
Director
Urban Child Research Center
Cleveland, Ohio

I commend your specific effort to establish a District Agent Education Extension Program as well as your general effort to bring a research and development focus to the education enterprise in this country.

Given the present condition of education and the problems confronting it, our society can ill afford to delay efforts toward solutions. Unless the challenge posed by the current state of urban education is met, crises of major proportion can be anticipated in a not distant future. Statistics regarding the dropout rate, declining achievement test scores, and drug and alcohol abuse set the stage for predictable consequences: adult illiteracy, unemployment, crime, family disruption, and ultimate community disintegration. These contribute, in turn, to the likelihood of educational failure, setting up a vicious cycle with truly astronomical costs to society and the individual.

The costs of failing to address these problems successfully are staggering, especially when we consider the costs required by the juvenile court system, the penal system, and other social and mental health agencies which must cope with those individuals for whom education has failed. The wasted expenditure of valuable human and financial resources should not be tolerated.

We are asking a lot of education, perhaps too much. The educational system--or non-system--cannot do all we ask without our help. A significant part of the problem--and the reason I call it a "non-system"--is that very point. There is no

coordinated approach, especially across school districts. The proposed plan for an District Agent Education Extension Program is important step in the right direction. To demonstrate the nature of my support for this program I will describe programs with which I am associated that are based on the land-grant university model.

The Land Grant University Model

The Morrill Act of 1862 endowed the state land-grant colleges with eleven million acres of public land and served as the educational complement to a national expansionist agrarian policy.[1] It set in motion continuing efforts to make university education more accessible to the public, to make research more relevant, and to make service more direct.

With the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 and the creation of the land grant college there began a refinement of the purpose and function of the university toward that of "public" higher education. And with the passage in 1867 of the Hatch Act, the purpose and function of the land-grant university was broadened even further to include a specific research function tied to the national priority of agricultural reform. The Hatch Act appropriated funds to each state for the establishment of agricultural experiment stations.

In 1914, 53 years after passage of the Morrill Act, the notion that a public, research university should have a special service function became national policy. The Smith-Lever Act linked the universities' agricultural research to the people, and made the Extension Service a legal educational arm of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. With the Smith-Lever Act, the Cooperative Extension Service became a nationwide system funded and guided by a partnership of federal, state and local governments and expected to deliver information to help people help themselves.

A series of national policy decisions, made over a 53-year period, led to the development of the public, research university, linked to the community through extension. This link to the community led to the development of an agricultural and rural constituency which continues to provide strong support for these programs today.[2]

The Urban University

The urban public research universities of today share some of the same principal concepts of the original land grant program: (1) to make higher education accessible to the public, and (2) to link the teaching and research of the university to the community it serves. Just as the land grant colleges were created in the 1860s, to implement agricultural reforms and educate the "industrial class," this new group of universities

emerged in the 1960s to meet the educational needs of the urban population. They were given a special mandate to serve the communities of which they were a part. They shared all of the same characteristics as the older public, land-grant research universities described above but added to these the following:

- *a distinct urban mission*
- substantial numbers of commuter students and a diverse student population
- programs designed to expand access to higher education for commuter and non-traditional students
- *applied research and service programs using the city as a laboratory*
- a range of professional schools or graduate programs
- *a sense of responsibility to urban constituents and a curriculum which explores issues of urban diversity, and*
- *sense of urgency to the need to address urban problems [emphasis added]*[3]

In the 1960s two efforts were undertaken to create urban extension programs based on the land-grant model. The Ford Foundation developed prototype "urban extension" programs to "put research to practical use to eliminate urban problems." These programs were judged a failure and were not continued.[4]

In 1968, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, created a national network of "urban observatories" with a similar goal. When federal funding for the program ended in 1974, only two of the original ten cities kept their observatories running.[5]

The Urban University "Movement"

In recognition of their obvious mandates as urban universities several of these schools organized themselves into a loose federation called the "Urban Thirteen" to push for wider acceptance of their urban roles and for federal and state funding to pursue this work. (Cleveland State University, my current affiliation, as well as the University of Massachusetts at Boston, my former affiliation, are members of this "Urban Thirteen" coalition.)

In the late 1970s there were federal-level attempts to build on the Morrill act reforms and provide a focus and funding for urban universities and urban extension efforts. As a result of these efforts congress passed Title XI, the Urban University Grant Program, as part of the 1980 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This program was designed to use the skills, talents, and knowledge of the nation's urban universities toward the solution of urban problems. However, no funds were appropriated for this program before the current Congress.

The Ohio Urban University Program

Although the federal initiative for the development of a national Urban University Grant Program did not obtain a national constituency, this concept was adopted in the State of Ohio. In 1979 the Ohio Board of Regents and the Ohio General Assembly

approved a proposal from Cleveland State University to establish and fund a program, based on the land-grant model, for urban-focused research and outreach activities at the state's universities located in the major urban centers. This action was taken in anticipation of the matching funds requirement of the proposed federal program. Since the federal funds never came, the Ohio Urban University Program remained relatively small.

Although relatively small, the Urban University Program has been quite successful--in providing research and technical assistance activities to urban areas and in demonstrating the workings of an urban university model that is similar to the land-grant model. Whereas the traditional model of state funding universities fund teaching activities with the expectation that professors will produce research and provide service assistance to the community. The land grant and the urban university models provide the bulk of funding to teaching but also add funding for both research and community service. The Ohio Urban University Program links the resources of Ohio's academic institutions to the state's urban communities to solve the unique problems of cities.

Ohio's Urban University Program has four components: (1) The College of Urban Affairs and its Urban Center at Cleveland State University, (2) the Urban Linkage Program, (3) the Northeast Ohio Inter-Institutional Program, and (4) the Urban Research and Technical Assistance Grant Program.

The Urban Center in the College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University links the expertise of faculty and professional staff with community, government, and business leaders. The College has two main units: the Department of Urban Studies which serves as the administrative unit of the College's instructional programs (including a Ph.D. in Urban Studies) and the Urban Center which serves as the administrative unit for all of the College's outreach programs.

In addition to the Cleveland effort, the Urban University Program supports seven other state universities which serve urban areas of not less than 500,000 persons: The University of Akron, the University of Cincinnati, Kent State University, Ohio State University, the University of Toledo, Wright State University and Youngstown State University.

The Urban University Program (UUP) carries out a range of research, training, technical assistance and database development activities. It has over a decade of experience, with research and outreach activities focused on program areas including: housing and neighborhood development, economic development, public management, and the Northern Ohio Data and Information Service (NODIS), one of three regional census data centers in the state.

While the concept and mission of an "Urban University" and the relevance of the urban extension continues to be debated

nationally, in Ohio the UUP represents a commitment by the State of Ohio to urban problem solving by linking the resources of public urban universities with the needs of their communities. For FY 1990, state funding increased to $3.6 million. This money has leveraged additional financial support from city governments, private foundations, state and federal agencies and private industry on approximately a one-to-one ratio. While this funding represents a significant increase over the initial state appropriation, it still is far less than the amount of state funding for the Ohio State University's Cooperative Extension Program. In FY 1990, OSU received a total of $36.4 million for Cooperative Extension and $29.4 million for Agricultural Research and Development.

The urban university model, as exemplified by Ohio, has the research expertise in urban issues but does not share the system of extension agents, nor multi-level public funding. These are situations that are addressed by proposals by this committee.

The Urban Child Research Center

A relevant recent addition to the Ohio Urban University Program is the Urban Child Research Center, a center for the interdisciplinary study of education and the urban child, at Cleveland State University. In recognition of the University's urban mission for addressing the issues concerning the education of urban children and youth this center was added in 1991.

The Center's ultimate research goal is to formulate and test models for effective intervention at critical points in urban childhood development--in order to maximize a young person's opportunity for a positive educational experience and to prevent predictable deleterious results if such intervention did not occur. Complementary professional goals are to provide a clearinghouse for related research, to integrate the knowledge and information gleaned from the Center's research with that conducted elsewhere, and to disseminate these findings to public policymakers, community leaders, social service personnel, educators, and the general public.

The primary goals of the Center are as follows:

1. To generate, to identify and to refine existing theoretical models upon which applied interventions have been based. Such refinement would be founded upon an understanding of those critical features which distinguish individual, project, program or agency/institutional success or failure.
2. To test the most promising existing models in a systematic and comprehensive manner.
3. To develop model project recommendations which recognize and reflect conditions and factors that urban educational settings have in common, while recognizing those characteristics unique to a given urban setting.

The Center's specific objectives include the following:

1. to constitute a multi-disciplinary team of scholars and practitioners to begin a systematic, multi-perspective examination of the challenges confronting urban education.
2. To aggregate and synthesize the existing research literature from across disciplines.
3. To identify "gaps" in existing research literature.
4. To identify and utilize existing information sources and data bases of community agencies and institutions. (Given limited time and resources, service agencies rarely have the luxury to utilize their massive longitudinal data bases for research purposes.)
5. To conduct evaluations of past interventions to determine what distinguishes "successful" from "unsuccessful" efforts.
6. To translate basic research findings into systematic guidelines for intervention and to disseminate such findings to the agencies and institutions of the community.

The Center also has several short-range objectives. Given the complex nature of the problems facing urban children and their families, it is expected that certain goals for the Center will not be achievable within a short time frame. This fact is

particularly relevant for the Center's ultimate research goal of formulating and testing models for effective intervention and prevention in urban settings. It is clear that many of these goals will necessarily take years to achieve. Consequently, certain short-range objectives have been established:

1. To establish a database which provides descriptive information on urban children, including demcgraphic measures, socioeconomic conditions, educational characteristics, and other variables which may cause these children to be "at risk" for inappropriate development.
2. To provide a resource pool of consultants who may advise community organizations, school personnel, social agencies, and government officials on approaches which may be used to address problems or achieve objectives.
3. To publish annual reports on the "status" of urban children in Cleveland and to relate this status with data on other cities that have similar characteristics.
4. To provide training in research methods for graduate students at Cleveland State University who are interested in pursuing topics related to the development and education of urban children.

Conclusion

I have described in some detail the Ohio Urban University Program as a means of showing my support for the proposed District Agent Education Extension (DAEE) Program for two reasons. First, I wanted to show the context of my support. The Ohio Urban University Program is based on the land-grant university model with its agricultural extension programs on which the DAEE Program is based. The second reason is to make note that similar, though less comprehensive, efforts have been in development. Consequently, there is some more directly relevant support for this potentially path-breaking program.

References

1. Berube, M.R. (1978). *The Urban University in America.* Westport: Greenwood Press.

2. Sweet, D.C. (1991, April). *Urban Extension in the Decade Ahead: Collaboration, Competition, or Contraction.* Paper presented at the North Central States Cooperative Extension Service Urban Conference.

3. Sweet, D.C. (1991). *Urban Extension in the Decade Ahead.* P. 7.

4. Sweet, D.C. (1991). *Urban Extension in the Decade Ahead.*

5. Sweet, D.C. (1991). *Urban Extension in the Decade Ahead.*

58-581 O - 92 - 5

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

You might know that in the present reauthorization of the Higher Education Assistance Act—I thought it was on its way to the floor, but it is being revised—there is the Urban University Act concept that has been renewed. It's still there. We hope that it will pass this time and that we can get an appropriation for it. It is not as directly related to education as I would like for it to be, but it is for general problem solving. As you pointed out, it is certainly in harmony with the proposal we make for learning grant institutions and district education agents.

I was impressed by a segment of your testimony which talked about existing information sources and data bases that are kept by community agencies and institutions. Can you give some examples of the kind of data you're talking about and how that would be useful for research in education?

Dr. REED. Well, that's generally something we know, and I'll give you two examples.

One is the center that I head is currently looking at some data that was collected by the early childhood education program of the City of Cleveland. They went out and collected a lot of data about what kind of services parents thought they needed to help with the growth, development, and education of their preschool children. This data is still in its raw form in closets. So we came along and said okay, we'll take a look at it and we'll evaluate it. We'll see how good the data are and then we can see what other kinds of data we might need to collect. That's one way. So there's a lot of that around, where agencies collect data but it never enters the arena where it's being used completely to evaluate what's going on and to give some proscriptions for the future.

Another way is that, in the State of Ohio, which I just moved to last year, each school district must submit computerized data on its program, including expenditures, the tracking of students and so on. Most of these school districts are busily trying to assemble this data to submit. There are no plans to do any analysis of the data. The new center which I am directing proposed to the Legislative Oversight Committee that I would like to get it when it gets to the State so that we could begin to use the data to provide some ongoing monitoring of the situation. Prior to that proposal, there was no anticipated use of the data other than by the legislative committee to evaluate how well the moneys are being spent.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Mr. Schultz, you said in your testimony that even a few ideologically inappropriate decisions can harm an agency's reputation for years. When the Assistant Secretary asked me to cite examples of partisan problems in the agency, I refused to document what the literature is filled with, but I wondered if you might have some particular examples where you say "even a few ideologically inappropriate decisions can harm an agency's reputation for years."

Dr. SCHULTZ. Well, I would agree with the Assistant Secretary in her statement that she was not aware of "recent"—certainly under her administration—publicity about problems, in terms of peer review processes or selection of grants or anything of that nature.

I think there was a celebrated situation involving some programs within the National Diffusion Network back relatively 8 or 10 years ago, and certainly there was great concern that there were efforts to weed out programs from that system that had been approved with evidence of their effectiveness based on ideological concerns about their content. I think that these things cast a long shadow. Whether it should happen or not, I would agree with the Assistant Secretary, that each new person should be judged on their merits and we should say there's a fresh page and let's move forward with confidence. And I also agree with her characterization of the staff being able and conscientious and well-meaning.

But I think the history of funding within that agency has not been one of a track record of success. I think these rumors or actual situations have been part of the problem in terms of the perception of major stakeholders and of people in Congress.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Mr. Keller, you mentioned the critical role technology can play in the area of more effective dissemination. To what extent are elementary and middle school principals making use of that technology now, and to what extent will they be building upon existing successes? Related to that, of course, would you comment on the Assistant Secretary's proposal for SMARTLINE and the possible relevance of that to elementary and middle school principals.

Mr. KELLER. Yes, sir. The best comment I could quickly make on this is that we made an attempt a few years ago to build a networking capacity among elementary principals who were participating in one of our professional development programs, so that there could be a lot of follow-through activity. We had enrolled in a networking electronic bulletin board in that whole process.

We found to our dismay that most people were not signing up for it, and when we asked why not, it wasn't that there wasn't a computer in their building. If you look at the data, better than 80 percent of elementary schools have one or more computers. The issue was, in an era of declining budgets at the local school level, school districts do not want to establish any more overhead expenditures than they have to. Getting this kind of an operation requires a dedicated line and that requires an overhead expense. That's what we were told. That is the difficulty in the whole process. In order to have the dedicated lines, you don't have the computers with the modems, you don't have a software product which will enable you then to access the great variety of sources that are out there, and you don't want to pay an overhead line charge figure monthly. That's where the problems are going to be for actual operational use of a system like that.

It could be tied into one system in a live city, at a central office, with everybody feeding in and out of it, which would be a different operation for a whole lot of places. It's difficult, at best. If we have a resurgence of the economy, all things are possible.

Chairman OWENS. Or if we spend the money we're spending differently.

Mr. KELLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman OWENS. We're still spending more than $100 billion on overseas bases in Germany and Japan.

What are we talking about when you say schools don't want to take on this overhead cost? Do you have an example of what that kind of cost would be?

Mr. KELLER. No, I don't. We were just getting that information from our principals. They didn't give us particular cost figures; it's just that if you do it for one building, you do it for all buildings and they just didn't want to get into that continual——

Chairman OWENS. It would be helpful——

Mr. KELLER. For line charges, it would be. If I can locate that, I could get that for you. I have a feeling it's not that great.

Chairman OWENS. I have a feeling it's not that great, either, compared to military costs.

Mr. KELLER. Exactly.

Chairman OWENS. One Sea Wolf submarine costs $2 billion. I'm sure we could wire all the schools in the country for $2 billion.

Mr. KELLER. We were told last week that we are still defending Norway at a cost of $20 billion.

Chairman OWENS. Defending Norway, yes. That's why we need these submarines.

Thank you very much for your testimony. Mr. Ballenger.

Mr. BALLENGER. I would just like to thank the gentlemen for showing up.

One question would come especially at the principal level, and also at the State level. Are there States or cities that have been able to withstand the financial disaster that has approached education just about throughout the country? If so, I would be interested to know how they have done it.

Everybody's hurting just about the same?

Dr. SCHULTZ. Yeah, I think so.

Mr. BALLENGER. That sort of information would be great to disseminate right now. I know at home it's a disaster, really. I think the economy is going to pick up.

Were all of these schools in existence in Ohio before they put that all together?

Dr. REED. These were universities in eight major metropolitan areas.

Mr. BALLENGER. But they already existed before they decided to put the whole group together?

Dr. REED. Yes. Let me give you an idea of the amount of funding we're talking about here. It's $3.6 million a year for these programs, which are basically research and technical assistance programs at some eight universities in the State. But yes, they were all in existence in urban areas.

Mr. BALLENGER. It was fascinating because I didn't know they had done that. North Carolina will have to start moving.

Dr. REED. It was based on this model, and the funds were put there in anticipation of the matching money.

Mr. BALLENGER. We're great up here for calling on matching money and then not match it.

Dr. REED. Right.

Mr. BALLENGER. I thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. I would like to invite all of you to submit additional testimony or recommendations for the record, if

you wish, within the next 10 days. We do appreciate your being here. Thank you very much for your testimony.

The subcommittee will not adjourn today. We will recess and continue our deliberations tomorrow at 10 a.m. in this same room.

[Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, March 18, 1992.]

[Additional material supplied for the record follows:]

STATEMENT OF DR. TOM SCHULTZ, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

Thank you for the opportunity to present our views on H.R. 4014 at your hearing on March 17. I would like to amplify our response to your question on proposed governance changes for OERI and the problem of inappropriate ideological influence in decision-making at the agency.

As I stated in my remarks, I agree with Assistant Secretary Ravitch's assertion that OERI staff are dedicated professionals, that peer review procedures are scrupulously adhered to, and that it's not right to criticize or penalize the agency for problems from the distant past. Fair enough.

However, I believe there is a larger argument about the public credibility of decisions on OERI priorities. Take the example of this year's appropriations request in which two expensive new initiatives are proposed: $25 million for grants to States to create curriculum frameworks and tests, and $15 million for the SMARTLINE electronic dissemination network. These ideas may have tremendous potential and popularity. But it's hard to know where they came from. I'm not aware of a substantial research base to indicate that these proposals are assured of success. In fact, recent OERI-sponsored research on California's new mathematics curriculum framework indicates that teachers interpret and implement this mandate in many different ways and with varying degrees of success. Similarly, many past efforts to transform educational practice through technology haven't worked out as intended. Nor am I aware that OERI can claim that these proposals come from an extensive, public process of planning or consultation with the public or experts. Thus, even without any suspicion of political influence, there are reasonable concerns about the basis for setting priorities at OERI, simply because its mission is so broad and because it has moved in such a variety of directions under past administrators.

These crucial strategic choices illustrate the potential for an oversight policy and priorities board such as you propose in H.R. 4014. I believe initiatives of this scope (and the choices to forgo alternatives such as funding research grants or thematic research institutes) should be presented and debated in a reasonable forum with experts and stakeholders.

Let me add two final points on the governance issue. Given NASBE's experience in the relationship between State boards of education and chief State school officers, we appreciate the problem of inappropriate board involvement in administration and management. The most important jobs for a board are to craft long-term direction for an agency, set major priorities of substance and strategy, and monitor the overall progress and quality of work. We thus agree with Dr. Ravitch's concerns that a board not possess inappropriate administrative functions. Similarly, we don't want a board which assumes all initiative in setting priorities. We need a strong, visionary Assistant Secretary. What we favor is a relationship in which the administrator presents and defends substantive/strategic priorities and responds to arguments and alternatives from board members. We believe this form of dialogue would add both quality and credibility to the agency's budget allocations and program structure.

Our second observation is that Congress may be equally culpable in using an agency like OERI as a vehicle for any and all project schemes, without the provision of broad consultation with experts or the public. We note in the Senate bill a sizeable initiative in international research and education, a teacher research dissemination network and other new small projects. These may be estimable ideas, but they may further complicate the core mission and substantive priorities of the agency. An additional problem is a pattern of proliferating discrete projects, none of which are large enough to exert substantial influence on our large national schooling enterprise. Five $20 million ideas in play may prohibit the prospect of ever trying a $200 million initiative. Thus, our concern is that Congress show appropriate regard for the recommendations of the proposed policy board.

We appreciate your attention to these additional thoughts. We hope this year's legislative debate will give OERI more resources, a clearer structure and mission, and new strategies for connecting its work with States, schools and local communities.

HEARING ON REAUTHORIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT (OERI)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1992

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:05 a.m., Room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Major R. Owens, Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Representatives Owens and Ballenger.

Staff present: Wanser Green; Robert MacDonald; and Andy Hartman.

Chairman OWENS. The hearing of the Subcommittee on Select Education will now resume. We recessed from our deliberations yesterday, and we will continue today with panel number four consisting of Dr. P. Kenneth Komoski, executive director of the EPIE Institute, Hampton Bays, New York. Dr. Komoski will begin by telling us what those initials stand for.

Good morning, Dr. Komoski. Welcome.

STATEMENT OF P. KENNETH KOMOSKI, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, EPIE INSTITUTE, HAMPTON BAYS, NY

Mr. KOMOSKI. Good morning. Thank you very much, Congressman, panel.

They stand for the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, better known as EPIE, and I'm here this morning to speak to you about an area of information research that represents a consistent omission from Federal support during the last quarter of a century.

It is this particular omission that has been the singular and the consistent mission of EPIE Institute for that time, ever since we began, 26 years ago, with the modest Federal support of $139,000. Now this mission has been to research and to create an exchange of unbiased information about the content and quality of educational products. These products are the foundation of classroom teaching and learning in that they are used over more than 90 percent of the 30 billion hours provided to 40 million students every year. That is 180 days of instruction, about 4 to 5 hours a day times 40 million learners; 30 billion hours our youngsters are putting in where these materials are used for 90 percent of all that time.

Our mission is based on a three-point premise. First, it is important to involve all educational consumers—teachers, parents, and learners themselves—in the process of evaluating and selecting materials for learning. Even when the learning material has been professionally evaluated, the ultimate evaluator of the material is the ultimate consumer of the material, the learner. The learner either opens the receptors, takes in the material, or closes the receptors.

The second point is that there must be a mechanism for gathering and exchanging unbiased information, including that feedback from learners. Obviously, it is not enough to gather this information from users and reviewers, it must also be disseminated quickly and inexpensively to those who need it, including the materials developers who can use this information to learn how better to engage learners in the learning practices. Now this is something that hasn't happened systematically in the education industry.

The third point is that the mechanism must also be used to close this serious loophole in the teaching and learning process. Neither consumers nor producers of learning materials systematically share the experience of users or the views of professional reviewers to create better products for learners. There is no fully developed mechanism to accomplish this.

The information exchange EPIE both advocates and represents is a far cry from the kind of information that most educational consumers have access to. It comes primarily from the vendors of the products that they are purchasing. Of course, these marketers have every right to provide their information to school and home consumers and to be as persuasive as possible when they are doing this, but there also needs to be access to an exchange of unbiased information as a counterbalance.

Without such an exchange of information, educational consumers will continue to be surrounded by the current commercial cacophony that willy-nilly promotes one educational fad after another. It will continue to be difficult for schools and home consumers to find out which of these increasingly numerous options are truly appropriate for particular learners that meet a teacher's teaching needs, that align with a school's intended learning outcomes.

The solution is an exchange of reliable, unbiased, easy-to-access, easy-to-understand information readily available to every school and home consumer nationwide, adequately funded, an educational products information exchange.

In short, we are in agreement with the statement, on page 31 of this committee's findings and considerations, "OERI cannot expect the marketplace, operating alone, to determine what eventually succeeds and what fails. It is both a tragedy and a travesty that there is no systematic exchange of unbiased information to help the marketplace do a better job of meeting the needs of teachers and learners."

The tragedy is more poignant when we realize how little money it would take to provide such a fully developed exchange. It can be done on the know-how and the existing product information data bases that EPIE Institute has been developing, particularly for the last decade. The cost of doing this would be under $5 million a year during the next 2 years.

Let me put this cost in perspective. Recently, I visited a school district in Florida which had spent, about 5 years ago, $5 million on a computer-assisted instructional system. Today, that system is not meeting their needs. They say they never should have bought it, and I believe they could have avoided that if they had had appropriate information about the way in which that system did not align with their curriculum when they purchased it.

As indicated, the task at hand can be accomplished most easily by expanding on EPIE Institute's established work. This has been, to a very great degree, funded by cooperative and contributed services from university-based consultant researchers over almost the entire 26 years of our existence. Of course, we have been sustained by more than these unpaid volunteers. Over the years, we have been funded by periodic foundation grants; we are also funded by income from consumers, from schools, from parents, and from State education agencies.

Interestingly, this support from consumers was one of the reasons we were given in the early eighties as to why the Federal Government shouldn't be funding this. The idea was, if you say you are a consumer information agency, you should be funded by the consumers that use your services. But, as a result, we have never been able, even with all the cooperation we have had from university people and school people, to build the kind of information exchange that really is needed in this country.

While the logic of that reasoning might be reasonable, the reality is that most consumers are so used to getting their product information from vendors who often come in toward the end of the school year and help them fill out the appropriate forms to get Federal and State moneys to buy their products.

EPIE's experience was summarized by the College Board Review which said, "Recourse to EPIE before choosing learning materials is an index of a school system's competence." Now our experience also confirms this. Over the years, the schools that have used our information services the most are the schools that need them the least, and the schools that need them the most are the ones that tend to use them the least. They are kind of complacent; they say, "Well, I'm getting the information." But even if the information is more—it is unbiased, it is more reliable. It is convenient to just take recommendations from sales people, not that sales people don't deserve to be out there doing a job, but they need to have other information balancing that.

But despite a continuing funding deficit, EPIE has persisted and managed to build and maintain a couple of data bases. The first one is the only comprehensive data base on educational software in the world. It contains over 10,000 products, information, and evaluation references on them from over 1,000 producers. It is accessible these days free of charge to all educators in those States that have joined EPIE in our States consortium for improving software selection. The States pay a license into the consortium, and every school, for instance, in Texas right now, is being given access to this data base. All 6,300 school buildings in the State of Texas for the first time have unbiased, accurate information on all educational software on the market.

In addition, we have designed and developed a much more comprehensive data base, the integrated instructional information resource. This data base can analyze the alignment of all types of learning materials against a school's or a State's curriculum framework and testing program. It can compare the scope and depth of a textbook's coverage to a school's or State's curriculum framework and intended learning outcomes. It can be used to create customized school-based versions of this data base to supply to teachers to put into instructional management systems that can give them reliable information, to enable them to manage information about all the instructional resources that are available to them.

A teacher wants to teach to a certain curriculum outcome: hit a key on an instructional management system with this data base in the management system; all the resources appropriate for teaching that particular outcome will become available to the teacher, all the information about them and where they are located in the school.

The data base is designed to be expanded and include all materials and all curriculum areas. When a publisher claims, as they invariably do, that a particular textbook aligns with 90 percent or better with a school's curriculum, our data base often demonstrates that even that 90 percent alignment may relate to no more than 40 or 50 percent of the textbook. In other words, as much as half of a given textbook may not relate to the curriculum at a given grade in a given school because that textbook addresses content dealt with at other grades in other schools or in other States.

We find the same kind of problem with a lot of the large computer-based instructional systems today. Unfortunately, without access to a data base that can show teachers which portions of a book really do align with the curriculum they are trying to teach, the teacher engages in a lot of wasted energy in addressing material in the textbook that isn't relevant, and nobody has told teachers, "Look, only 40 percent of this book, only 72 percent of this book, only 60 percent of this book is relevant to the curriculum. Don't spend time on the rest of it."

This data base, if it were used by publishers, could also bring about the advent of customized textbook publishing where a school would be able to say, "This is what we are trying to achieve in our curriculum. I want only materials that relate to this. Get those lessons developed and delivered electronically to schools." That would avoid this wasted time that is taking place. I don't know what the estimate might be of those 30 billion hours, but an awful lot of them are wasted time because of this lack of alignment between resources and the teaching that is taking place.

So we see this data base, in particular, as the foundation on which the kind of exchange I have been describing can be built. We see it funded partially by foundation moneys and Federal moneys. We would like to see a matching arrangement worked out.

It is an opportunity to supply every consumer, both in homes and in schools, with the kind of information they need to meet their needs. A teacher or a parent could say, "This is what we are trying to achieve; here's the kind of approach I want to take; here's the price I'm willing to pay; here's the kind of skills I want developed

in reading, thinking, problem solving," and get information that is unbiased and accurate about products that can do those jobs.

We see a fully developed educational products information exchange as a complement to the Department of Education's proposed SMARTLINE; we see it being very supportive of the initiative that is coming out of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for community learning centers; we see this data base being perhaps available on Internet, on any one of the emerging movements toward NREN. But to do that, there needs to be the resources to do the kind of work to fully expand this.

Following this initial period of foundation and Federal capitalization of development, we see ongoing funding being sustained by just a yearly $100 fee from all the school and public libraries that we would see being the local information outlets for this information.

In conclusion, I really would like to ask two questions. Why hasn't there been Federal research support for the full development of the kind of information exchange that schools need? Isn't now the time to provide such support when it can build upon work that is already under way?

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of P. Kenneth Komoski follows:]

PRESENTATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SELECT COMMITTEE
On issues relating to H.R. 4014
The Honorable Major Owens of New York Presiding

presented by

KENNETH KOMOSKI
Executive Director
Educational Products Information Exchange
103-3 West Montauk Highway
Hampton Bays, NY 11946
(516) 728-9100

My name is Kenneth Komoski, Executive Director of Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, a not-for-profit product information and evaluation agency, better known as EPIE.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you about an area of information research that represents a consistent omission in Federal support during the last quarter of a century.

It is this particular omission that has been the singular and consistent mission of EPIE Institute ever since it was founded 26 years ago with the help of modest Federal funding of $139,000. Our mission has been to research and to create an exchange of unbiased information about the content and quality of education products that are purchased and used for instruction by schools. Such products are the foundation of classroom teaching and learning in that they are used during more than 90% of the 30-billion hours of instruction provided to our nation's 40-million learners each year.

Succinctly put, our mission is to improve the quality of decisions being made about the selection and use of these products by school and home consumers. This mission is based on a three point premise:

#1 - It is important to involve all education consumers, teachers, parents and learners, themselves, in the process of evaluating and selecting materials for learning. Even when the learning material has been professionally evaluated, the ultimate evaluation of the material is the "ultimate consumer", the learner. Put bluntly: does it work for learners or doesn't it?

#2 - There must be a mechanism for gathering and exchanging unbiased evaluative product information -- especially the feedback from learners and reviewers. But, it is not enough to gather information from users and reviewers; it must also be disseminated quickly and inexpensively to those who need it, including materials developers who can use it to learn how better to engage learners in the learning process by developing more learner-engaging products.

#3 - This mechanism must be used to close a serious loophole in the teaching and learning process: neither consumers nor producers of teaching/learning materials systematically share the experience of users or the views of professional reviewers to create better products for learners. There is no fully-developed mechanism to accomplish this.

It is important that the product information exchange envisioned here includes feedback not only from and to consumers of education materials but to the producers of such materials as well, particularly because, like consumers, publishers of learning materials lack the resources, the mechanism for gathering feedback from users that would help them improve the instructional effectiveness of products over time.

This is unfortunate given the fact that the electronic, digitized nature of all educational media today makes product improvement using feedback from learners -- the learner-verification-and-revision process -- far simpler than it was 20 years ago, when EPIE first testified to the Congress on the value of this still-promising process.

The information exchange EPIE both advocates and represents is a far cry from the information most readily available to educational consumers. It is well known that such information comes overwhelmingly from the marketing and advertising efforts of vendors, hardly an unbiased source.

Of course, these marketers have every right to provide their information to school and home consumers -- and to be as persuasive as they please. However, consumers also need access to an exchange of unbiased information as a counterbalance to these messages.

Without such an unbiased information exchange, educational consumers will continue to be surrounded by a commercial cacophony that, willy-nilly, adds to the faddism that has plagued education for far too long. Without such information, it will continue to be difficult for schools and home consumers to find out which of their increasingly numerous options are truly appropriate for particular learners, that meet a teacher's needs, and that align well with a school's intended learning outcomes. The solution is an exchange of reliable, unbiased, easy to access and understand information, that is available to every school and home consumer -- a nationwide, adequately funded, educational products information exchange.

In short, we agree with the statement on page 31 of this committee's Findings and Considerations: "OERI cannot expect the 'marketplace' -- operating alone -- to determine what eventually succeeds and what fails."

It is both tragedy and travesty that there is no adequately funded exchange of unbiased information to help the marketplace do a better job of meeting the needs of teachers and learners. The tragedy is more poignant when we realize how little money it would take to provide such a fully-developed exchange by building on the know-how and existing product information databases that EPIE Institute has been developing for the past decade.

The cost of doing this would be under $5-million a year during the next three years. Let me put this cost in perspective: I recently visited a school district which, five years ago, had spent $5-million on a computer-based instructional system -- which they now realize is not meeting their curricula needs -- largely, I believe, because they did not have access to information which would have helped them in their decision-making.

Putting this in even sharper focus, many of those five million misspent dollars, in all probability, were provided through Federal and state-funded programs. One is left to wonder how many times this scenario has been repeated.

As indicated, the task at hand can be accomplished most easily by expanding on EPIE Institute's established work, which is done largely by trained teams of school and university-based consultant-researchers, many of whom have volunteered to contribute their services to help EPIE pursue its persistently under-funded efforts to develop the vision of a nationwide product information exchange.

Thankfully, though, EPIE's work has been sustained by more than unpaid volunteers. Over the years EPIE has been funded by periodic grants from private foundations whose generosity and concern for our mission has partially compensated for a lack of Federal research support. In addition, EPIE receives funds from subscription and contract fees from school and home consumers as well as state education agencies.

Interestingly, it was this support from consumers, which during the early 1980s was given as a reason for the Federal government's declining EPIE's request for R&D funding. The reason, as stated by the then-director of the National Institute of Education, was that since EPIE's mission is to provide information to educational consumers, its work should be paid for by those consumers.

While the logic may seem reasonable, the reality is that most education consumers are so used to getting their product information from vendors -- vendors who often help them with the paper work and regulations of purchasing with Federal and state funds -- that they can't see why they should have to pay for information even if it is unbiased and more reliable. And those willing to pay have never been great enough in number to enable EPIE to aggregate its needed R&D funding.

Reflecting on this prevailing reality, The College Board Review has said: "Recourse to EPIE before choosing learning materials is an index of a school system's competence."

EPIE's experience confirms this. Over the years, the schools that have used EPIE's information services the most are the schools that need them the least: they are already good consumers. But the schools that need such information the most are either reluctant about paying for it, or too complacent and unconcerned to seek it out.

In contrast, concerned parents are willing to pay, and wealthier parents seem willing to pay enough to cover the cost of providing information to those who are less able to pay -- something that EPIE does regularly.

Despite a continuing funding deficit, EPIE persists and has managed to build and maintain the only comprehensive database of unbiased descriptive and evaluative information on educational software products (over 10,000 from more than 1000 publishers.)

This database is accessible, free of charge to all educators, in those states that have joined with EPIE to form the States Consortium for Improving Software Selection (SCISS). Through the Consortium each member state is provided an unlimited license to distribute the database for use in all its educational institutions. In Texas, for instance, this means that this EPIE database on educational software is being made available to teachers in all of the state's 6300 schools at a cost of less than four dollars a school.

In addition, we have designed and are developing a much more comprehensive database: The Integrated Instructional Information Resource (IIIR). This integrated database has many uses:

* It can analyze the alignment of all types of learning materials (from textbooks to high-tech multi-media products) to a school's or state's curriculum framework and testing programs.

* It can compare the scope and depth of a textbook's coverage to a school's or state's curriculum framework and intended learning outcomes and also identify and align non textbook resources.

* It can be used to create customized, school-based, subdatabases to help teachers plan and manage all of a school's instructional resources.

* It is designed to be expanded to include all materials, curricula and tests in all school curriculum areas.

When publishers claim, as they invariably do, that a particular textbook aligns with 90% or better of a school's curriculum, this EPIE database often demonstrates that even a 90 percent alignment may relate to no more than 40 or 50 percent of a textbook. In other words, as much as half of a given textbook may not relate to the curriculum at a given grade in a given school because it addresses content dealt with at other grades, in other schools, or in other states. We find similar alignment problems with computer-based instructional systems.

Unfortunately, without access to a database that can show teachers which portions of a book align with 90% of the curriculum their students are required to learn, untold instructional hours are wasted. In addition, this database also lets teachers know which non-textbook resources are available to them to compensate for these inevitable shortcomings of a particular textbook.

were it to be used by textbook publishers, this particular database could greatly facilitate the advent of customized textbook material that could help publishers to electronically deliver to schools only those text lessons that are relevant to the teaching of a school's intended curriculum outcome. Such customized publishing is already happening in the college marketplace and should rapidly be extended to K-12 education.

We see this database as the foundation on which the fully-developed educational product information exchange I have been describing can be built. Ideally, we see the development of this exchange capitalized over the next few years through a combination of foundation and Federal grant support. Were this to occur soon, by 1995 every school and home consumer of educational products in the country could have ready access to unbiased, independently researched information about every learning material relevant to the learning outcomes intended by local and state curriculum frameworks. The user would be able to specify and receive information based on a specified learning need and learner characteristics, intended outcome, preferred medium, teaching approach, price range, level of skills in reading, thinking, problem solving, etc.

We see this access being provided to schools through the country's 75,000 school libraries where it could be an essential support for school-based decision-making by teachers, and through public libraries where it could be used by parents and other home consumers. Special versions of it might even be available in computer software outlets and bookstores, where parents and learners would be able to examine the products they have identified using the database.

We also see a fully developed Educational Products Information Exchange as a complement to the Department of Education's Smartline Initiative. We also see its dissemination facilitated by the EPIE's growing States Consortium, as well as the Community Learning Center Network envisioned by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, using Internet, which would enable on-line, at-home use.

We also see the local use of the Exchange supporting the work of the District Education Agents proposed in H.R. 4014. Such local agents have long been needed by educators and parents.

Following this initial period of foundation and Federal capitalization of its full development, we see ongoing funding for sustaining continuous updating of the exchange derived from a modest annual subscription of less than $100 from each of the school and public libraries that would become the Exchange's local delivery system, plus an even smaller fee paid by those parents able and willing to pay it.

In conclusion, because the Federal research omission of support for an educational products information exchange has persisted for so many years, it seems valid to end with two questions:

1 - Why hasn't there been Federal research support for the full development of such an exchange during the last quarter of a century?

2 - Isn't now the time to provide such support when it can build upon work that is already underway and that directly relates to the improvement of the quality of each of the 30-billion instructional hours engaged in each year by our country's 40-million young learners?

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Mr. Komoski, let me begin by making it clear in the record that I spent 20 minutes with you in my office, and I was fascinated by your explanation of what your organization does. I also was shocked that I had not heard of you before, except in passing. I had heard the initials, but not really understood fully what your organization did. I don't think you have appeared before any congressional committees since I have been in Congress, and this is my tenth year.

Mr. KOMOSKI. Jack Brademas invited me 21 years ago, Congressman.

Chairman OWENS. Twenty-one years ago, you were here before a committee of Congress.

Mr. KOMOSKI. To testify on these same issues.

Chairman OWENS. Twenty-one years ago.

Have you appeared before or been sought by any of the present organizations seeking to establish standards and goals and testing? We are racing to get in place Federal standards, world-class standards, and the framework for developing tests. Have you been invited by any of those groups to testify?

Mr. KOMOSKI. No, I haven't. I wrote to Dr. Ravitch, who is a former colleague of mine at Teachers College, Columbia, and she has arranged for me to meet with a few of her staff people. We have had one discussion about SMARTLINE.

Chairman OWENS. But Governor Romer's committee has not consulted at all with you?

Mr. KOMOSKI. No.

Chairman OWENS. The components of the world-class curriculum could certainly benefit from an examination of the kind of work you are doing where you can pinpoint where things have gone wrong and things have gone right in great detail. I find it very strange that you have not been consulted.

I also find it strange in an era when privatization has been stressed by the previous administration and by this administration. And, when they say privatization, they don't mean necessarily a profit-making organization, they mean an organization outside the government.

Mr. KOMOSKI. Right.

Chairman OWENS. You seem to me to be the perfect kind of private sector operation that would greatly benefit what we are attempting to do as we move toward a greater Federal involvement in standard setting and testing. So it is really a great oversight on the part of government.

Let me ask you a few questions about how your organization operates. We are very much concerned about boards nowadays and what boards can and can't do. One of the things I'm concerned about is the guarantee that the integrity of an organization like yours would be maintained and would remain above question and we could always rely on the greatest possible objectivity. What kind of board do you have?

Mr. KOMOSKI. We have a very small board, the chairperson of which is a school principal. Another member of the board is a program officer at the National Action Committee for Minorities in Engineering; she was a curriculum coordinator in District 4 in

Harlem a few years ago. Another member is the recently retired head of instruction in media for the State Department of Education in Georgia. Another board member is the retired comptroller of Barnard College at Columbia University. Another is the dean of a school of education, formerly the dean at Long Island University, now at New York Institute of Technology, Helen Green. I have a list of other board members that I could give to you.

We have kept the board small simply because in many ways we haven't had the resources to pull together a lot of people for meetings. The Regents of the State of New York which we were chartered by have now allows us to have telephone meetings, so that has reduced our cost of board meetings.

Chairman OWENS. Would you say that your organization is a monopoly in the Nation, that there is nothing else like it?

Mr. KOMOSKI. We have been a monopoly, Congressman, for 26 years.

Chairman OWENS. There is no other organization that you know of that does similar kinds of things?

Mr. KOMOSKI. No, no. It is a bit of an irony, but as I think I said in my printed testimony, as Jimmy Durante once said, "Dem is de conditions dat prevails."

Chairman OWENS. To what degree are you computerized, and to what degree can you tie in with modern systems?

Mr. KOMOSKI. All of our information now is computerized and is electronically accessible and usable. The data base on instructional software is now being, as I say, made available free of charge electronically in the States that have joined our States consortium—Texas, New York, Georgia, Michigan, and Indiana—and this is after just about a year.

There are about 10 other States now that are very anxious to join. Many State agencies with big cutbacks just are looking at the initial year's funding for the data base—the fee is $25,000—and that has been a sticking point. In Michigan, the State Department said they couldn't put up the money for the first year, so they went to the Mott Foundation which put up the $25,000. By the second year, you see, the fee comes down.

We give an audited report to the States that belong to the consortium at the end of the year: This is how much it costs us to maintain that data base. So, depending on the number of States in the consortium, we divide that number by the number of States, and that would be the second year fee. So the fee for the second year of the States that helped us form the consortium in the first year dropped from $25,000 to $18,000. If all 50 States belonged, and were supporting that particular data base, this could get down under $10,000 per year per State.

In Texas right now, however, the cost of delivering all this information to schools comes down to about $4 a school building because of the large number of buildings in the State.

Chairman OWENS. And the number of States in the consortium now is how many?

Mr. KOMOSKI. Five.

Chairman OWENS. Just five States.

Mr. KOMOSKI. But that is just in a year. There are at least 10, perhaps a dozen, that are almost, I would say, on the verge of coming in.

Chairman OWENS. What do you get for that $10,000? Tell us a little more detail.

Mr. KOMOSKI. They get access to all the information. They get a master copy of the data base of information on educational software. Understand, it is just on educational software—10,000 programs from over 1,000 publishers. It comes in two versions; there is the full data base, which takes 35 megabytes; and there is another version, that is eight megabytes, which just covers under 3,000 products, the most recently to come on the market and the most highly rated software.

I need to say one thing about evaluating educational software. There is so much of it that comes out that we monitor evaluations from 41 evaluation sources, from journals, from our own evaluations, from State agencies. There are now over 10,000 products on the market; only about 4,000—maybe a little more than 4,000—have been evaluated by anybody because of the proliferation of products, and it costs money to evaluate and to gather information from users, and that is really what I am addressing here this morning. People are having to fly blind, you see.

Chairman OWENS. I would think that some publishers and suppliers of educational materials would love you and a lot would hate you.

Mr. KOMOSKI. But increasingly, Congressman, because you have had this implosion going on in the textbook industry where fewer and fewer companies are making more and more of the products, and an explosion in the software marketplace, you have over 1,000 producers of software, most of them small, they can't compete in the advertising-marketing game, and they love the idea that there is an independent source where they can send their material and get information out to schools.

When Texas—I have to say it—when Texas joined the consortium, producers we had trouble getting some information from were suddenly calling us every other day, wanting to be sure that the information on their product was in the data base.

Chairman OWENS. You service mostly schools and institutions now. There is a growing market for products to families and homes. In fact, I think when the present Secretary of Education talks about reinventing the way we do schooling, he has in mind a lot of movement of concern the way education is attempted outside of the school building, which means we will be placing greater and greater emphasis on what youngsters do at home and what kind of exposure they have to educational products in the home.

Mr. KOMOSKI. Before I left my office yesterday, I answered three phone calls on Hooked on Phonics. That is typical. That is a typical day at EPIE. I might answer three; another staff person might answer four or five. This product, a $25,000 product, is being very vigorously marketed.

Chairman OWENS. What do you mean by $25,000?

Mr. KOMOSKI. The $25,000 investment that this company has made. There is no evidence that the product works. It may. I suspect that if you try to teach phonics with audio and printed materi-

al, you will do a pretty decent job of it. So it may, in fact, work quite well, but nobody really knows. The company has not been willing to send us a review copy, and we are getting calls from parents, schools, and most frequently from reporters of local newspapers because the airwaves are being deluged with advertising. Last year, I believe, the Washington Post or the San Francisco Chronicle estimated that the advertising expenditures for that one product has been $29 million. The product has brought in, by our estimate, over $100 million in income for a $25,000 investment.

Now that may be fine; it may be a wonderful product, but nobody really knows. We would love access to information about people who bought the product and randomly speak with those people. I mean select them randomly and speak with them and find out what is going on.

There is going to be, I predict, an increasing use of instructional materials, learning materials, in homes as the software industry begins to figure out finally in this next decade how to market software to homes. That is going to happen, I predict, through the access of software on CD-ROM or other CD-ROM-like technology where you can get information, I hope from us, to find out what you are interested in, then go to a CD-ROM, take the EPIE ID number, just have that software come up, examine it, have your child use it; if you like it, you are on a modem, you put your credit card number in, and that software is de-encrypted, the full software de-encrypted, from the CD-ROM into your home computer, and that is going to happen in this next decade. The somewhere between half-million and million homes that now do home schooling are going to be using that mechanism.

Chairman OWENS. Mr. Komoski, I represent the tenth poorest district in the country—out of 435, we rank tenth in poverty—and yet there are more people—well, the only product of this kind that people are using is Hooked on Phonics. The radio stations which cater to the people who live in my district all have advertisements on Hooked on Phonics.

I would like for the record to show at this point that we are discussing Hooked on Phonics in great detail, and I would be happy to extend an invitation to the manufacturers of Hooked on Phonics to appear before the committee to rebut any statements that they think are unfair.

But you have described a product which has grossed $100 million for a $25,000 investment, and have put $25 million into advertising, and I think it is important to explore this a little further.

Are you saying that your organization has evaluated Hooked on Phonics or has not evaluated Hooked on Phonics? You don't evaluate any product that doesn't ask you to, doesn't send you review copies?

Mr. KOMOSKI. No, no. We request products for evaluation, and we would be happy to evaluate that, but, as I said earlier, I would like to have access to a broad range of people who have purchased the product, and then I would like to randomly go in and find out what happened with them.

I really do believe that if you want to teach phonics—that is, the sounding out of words—if you have a cassette that is geared to the reading of words and sentences, that it will work. I'm not arguing

whether the product is working or not. I think, however, there are many other options out there.

For instance, the Reading Volunteers of America, that has a $30,000 public relations and advertising budget, markets products that are of high interest, low reading ability in biography, in job awareness, all kinds of topics, $3.50 apiece. They are very attractive, wonderful materials. They don't have information out there letting these people know who are investing $179.95, I think it is, for Hooked on Phonics. They don't know that there are very low cost alternatives to this kind of product.

Chairman OWENS. Turning to H.R. 4014 more directly, you mentioned SMARTLINE. You have had some kind of consultation with the assistant secretary with respect to SMARTLINE. How do you see SMARTLINE interacting, in some way being related to your present work?

Mr. KOMOSKI. Well, I said in my testimony that I believe that what we are doing, if it were fully funded, would be an excellent complement to SMARTLINE. By that I mean filling it out. I think SMARTLINE is going to deal greatly with educational programs that have been funded by the Federal Government; it is going to deal with research questions; it is going to answer all kinds of questions, I think on childhood development, on ideas for teachers teaching; I think it could have great value.

But I think there needs to be an agency that is independent of the Federal Government, that is perhaps funded in part by the Federal Government—a foundation Federally-funded—that would have the sole responsibility of monitoring the commercial products. The Federal Government has never looked at commercially available products, and that is what I mean by a complement. If SMARTLINE gets established and there is a delivery mechanism to school libraries and public libraries and—I say in my printed testimony—the kind of support that our information could give to your excellent suggestion of district education agents, if SMARTLINE can deliver information to those people, they will need information about commercially available products, because the Federal Government has never supplied information about them and I don't think really should.

I think there are things the Federal Government might do to improve the quality of those products that the industry, I think, would be—21 years after I testified on this issue—would be perhaps more willing to go along with. But I don't think the Federal Government should take on the task of supplying information about commercial products to school and home consumers. I think that should be the job of an agency like ours.

The Federal Government doesn't fund and manage Consumers Union. Consumers Union can be supported by home consumers, because there is a large array of products they are interested in. I believe it is important for the Federal Government to supply partial funding for a consumers union in education—which a lot of people say is what we are—because there hasn't been evidence in 26 years of the kind of income from consumers themselves to be able to support the kind of research that needs to be done to supply information on all the products that are out there.

Chairman OWENS. Do you publish a bulletin or newsletter?

Mr. KOMOSKI. We have a newsletter called EPIE-gram that deals with issues and supplies information about, for instance, the latest educational software that comes on the market each month; we carry information about that software.

Chairman OWENS. How widely distributed is your newsletter?

Mr. KOMOSKI. Not very widely distributed at all, maybe 5,000 at its most expansive over the years; we are now about 2,000.

Chairman OWENS. Yesterday, the Secretary mentioned that SMARTLINE wanted to make information to parents a very high priority. Do you think that your organization and the type of things you do would help accomplish that?

Mr. KOMOSKI. Absolutely. Absolutely. I mean we are now carrying, I imagine, the brunt of calls. When the IRA—that is not the Irish Republican Army, but the International Reading Association—receives calls about Hooked on Phonics, they tell people to call us, you see. When university reading departments get calls, they say, "Call EPIE Institute." Despite the fact that you didn't know—and perhaps other Congressmen don't know—about us, the university community does tend to know about us.

Chairman OWENS. They are smarter than we are?

Mr. KOMOSKI. Well, we have been around trying to get their information for a longer period of time. So, when a hot potato comes along about, "What are you going to say about this?" they say, "Well, call EPIE."

What we can say to these people about Hooked on Phonics—and we haven't evaluated it in any systematic way—is that it purports to be a very effective kind of reading program. Now use your common sense. If it has no extended reading in it, just single sentences, does it deserve to be called a reading program? It is limited just to teaching the sounding out of words, not understanding what the person who wrote is thinking and you are now thinking in line with that person. Reading is thinking, and it doesn't teach that. Now it ought to say it doesn't do that.

Chairman OWENS. I yield to Mr. Ballenger.

Mr. BALLENGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Komoski, it is fascinating to me. Like I say, I had never heard of you before, and it appears that you might be supplying a very useful product.

I am just curious, knowing that Texas was your kind of star, was it the School Book Commission in Texas that decided—they had so much to do down there about what is in their schoolbooks and what is not in their school books and that kind of stuff. Was that where they came from to talk to you? I mean how did they approach you?

Mr. KOMOSKI. First of all, Texas wasn't the first; I want to make that clear. Michigan and Georgia and New York were the first States; Texas came in after they did.

The reason things got started in Texas was that a university-based center for technology funded by TEA—and I happen to know the director, and he said, "Ken, if you give me a copy of this data base for 30 days, I will be sure that the appropriate people in the Texas Education Agency and around the State will see this, and when they see it they are going to want it, and they will want to

participate in this consortium," and that was exactly what happened.

In Texas, however, in response to your question about the textbook commission, the 20 regional service centers gave EPIE a contract last summer to analyze the content of the newly adopted four series in mathematics, because of the continuing findings that we have with most textbooks, as I said in my testimony, that yes, 90 percent of your curriculum may be covered in the book but it may be covered in only 40 percent of the book, you see.

So the 20 regional centers said, "Give us information that we can supply to teachers to enable them to say, 'Well, here are the Texas essential elements, their curriculum outcomes, that we are interested in, we must be teaching at this grade, the fifth grade. Where in the book are those?'" So we did a hard copy—we call them the "Teacher's Friend"—hard copy kind of manual to go along with the Texas essential elements in the textbooks.

One thing I will say for the producers of the textbooks that were selected by Texas, They were coming closer to the kind of customized textbook electronic system that I described in my testimony, because we found that the alignment to the essential elements in Texas of those four series—now, understand, a lot were rejected—so these four series were more responsive, and in most cases there was at least an 80 percent match, in some cases more.

This is very encouraging. The entire textbook industry could do this, not just for a State the size of Texas, which spends all those hundreds of millions of dollars, but it really is economically feasible to do this for almost any school district: What are you trying to achieve? Give us the information about it clearly stated, and have the companies using a data base—they wouldn't have to use ours, but they could have something that they could do themselves—I think ours would be a lot more reliable—but be able to then customize the lessons.

So often when a textbook is put in the hands of a teacher, yes, that particular outcome that they are interested in is covered, but it is in one lesson. If that is a mathematics book, as they are in Texas right now, that is two pages. Yes, it is covered, but is it? With the kind of data base that we would deliver to schools under the process I was describing, teachers would know what information other than textbook, what computer software, what video material, what multi-media material are available.

We are already entering into our software data base information on CD-ROM availability, the materials available from so-called integrated learning systems, which we call integrated instructional systems. They are not full learning systems; they are really tight instructional systems, but we are building that data base to eventually contain information on all electronic materials.

One of the things you have got to realize is, these days, every material that a youngster learns with is electronic. It is all digitizable and has all been digitized at some point in its process of development.

Mr. BALLENGER. I wonder if I might ask this. I come from a kind of rural area of North Carolina. What capacity would a school system have to have? Could you do it with just a small computer, a

PC, or would it take something bigger than that? I realize they are going to have to have the phone connection and so forth.

Mr. KOMOSKI. No. What the States are doing is recognizing, even Texas, which is pretty sophisticated and has a pretty large installed base of modems in schools, that they can distribute the data base on disk. A district can come in and bring a blank disk into one of the 20 regional service centers in Texas, as I understand the way they are distributing it, and they just make a copy of the short version of the data base, the 8-MEG version, which is the most recent software and the most highly rated software. The full data base, 35 MEGS, yes, that is beyond the capacity of most schools.

They copy the other data base that I am talking about, the integrated instructional resource data base which interrelates textbooks and curriculum and software and tests.

Do you know where Reidsville, North Carolina, is?

Mr. BALLENGER. Yes, sure.

Mr. KOMOSKI. Fine. We have done a study for the Reidsville schools. The superintendent—I have forgotten his name right now—called me 2½ years ago and said he had heard about the data base, and would we do an alignment study for him regarding the North Carolina State curriculum and the local test that they were using, the standardized test.

By the way, the misfit and the misalignment of standardized tests to school and State curriculum is just as bad as textbooks. So here you have got a textbook that doesn't align with what I'm trying to teach and a test that is not really measuring what I'm trying to teach.

One of the first uses of the data base came about when somebody in the AFT came to us and said, "We've had a bunch of teachers suspended because their kids didn't perform well on a particular test. We would like to give you a contract to analyze how well this test"—that supposedly was assessing the curriculum really did line up with the curriculum and the material, and it was a miserable fit. The district in question ended up throwing the test out and saying to the teachers, "Okay, we are going to develop a criterion reference test that really does measure the curriculum we are asking you to teach."

Mr. BALLENGER. One more question. Is any of the rest of the State of North Carolina involved?

Mr. KOMOSKI. We would love to have them.

Mr. BALLENGER. I think I might get them involved, is what I was thinking, unless you are already working on it.

Mr. KOMOSKI. And one of the things I know that North Carolina is interested in right now as a State, Congressman, is instructional management systems. They have been doing an analysis of instructional management systems which are systems that teachers use to organize information about their teaching. We have just completed an evaluation of the major instructional management systems on the market, and as we did these evaluations, the companies all recognized that one of the great resistances to the use of these systems by teachers is that they have got to input information about everything they are going to use. It is a daunting job.

If the three of us entered information on resources, we are doing it kind of idiosyncratically, so you get an unreliability. So what the

companies have said to us is, could they have the school district they are dealing with contract with us to create information of a reliable nature about all the resources that the teachers have access to and then port that into an instruction management system that the school would purchase. We think that North Carolina's activity right now is to figure out what instruction management systems they would recommend that the schools use. It would be an excellent staging ground for the porting in of the kind of information I have been describing here today, customized to each school district.

Right now, what we are doing and what we did for Reidsville is, we charge a few thousand dollars a grade level to code all this material in, and we provide the information in a hard copy report. What we would do in this case, however, would be to put it in electronic form and put it into that system.

Understand, if we have to do this school system by school system, it is quite expensive. What I am proposing here is appropriate funding that would enable us to customize this information by every State's set of curriculum outcomes, have that available to school systems in that State. I believe that all of that could be delivered, not for a couple of thousand dollars a grade level in a curriculum area, as we now have to charge, but for $100 a school building. We could regularly update it and supply to teachers and those school buildings the kind of resource that we use to train our coders to put information into the data base. I believe that we could increase the reliability of teachers just putting in information about materials that they have developed themselves, the noncommercial materials; we could take care of the commercial materials, but there is a lot of good material that teachers do create, and they could put information about that into their data base locally and other teachers would be able to share it.

Mr. BALLENGER. It just appears to me that the possibilities are unbelievable. I mean we are all griping about the quality of our teachers, but with the kind of capabilities you have in your system you could do a great deal.

I was thinking of the University of North Carolina system that has five teachers colleges that would be—it would be ideal for these teachers colleges to recognize that they have this kind of assistance available to them.

Mr. KOMOSKI. In Michigan, one of the first things they did when they joined the consortium was to put our data base of information on computer software into all the teacher training institutions, so the teachers, as you say, coming into the system will know that there are these options out there.

I recently attended a national conference on computing, and the question I always ask these computer coordinators from around the country is, "Well, how many producers of educational software do you think there are?" and they say, "Oh, there are hundreds." "Well, how many hundreds?" "Well, three or four hundred, maybe 500." Well, there are over 1,000, and these people are deluged, helter-skelter, willy-nilly, with information from all these producers.

Now what you have got in schools is this enormous mixture of data on information about testing, about materials, about curricu-

lum, but it is data, it is not information. Teachers are deluged with data, but it is not information. The kind of structure we are talking about can make those data into information, put it in formation for teachers' use, and I believe we could improve instruction enormously, because there is an enormous amount of slippage going on because of the lack of alignment between instructional outcomes, instructional resources, and assessment instruments.

Mr. BALLENGER. Thank you, sir.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KOMOSKI. You are very welcome.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you very much, Mr. Komoski. If you will invite us, I certainly would like to visit your Institute. It is not that far away from my district.

Mr. KOMOSKI. We are on the Long Island Railroad.

Chairman OWENS. Perhaps Mr. Ballenger would like to join me to get a little more detail about what you are doing.

Mr. KOMOSKI. We would love to have you. It is a 2-hour and 20-minute ride from the Atlantic Avenue station of the Long Island Railroad, and the Long Island Railroad station is right across from our office in Hampton Bays. We would love to see you.

Chairman OWENS. Well, we look forward to visiting you. Thank you very much for appearing here today.

Mr. KOMOSKI. Thank you for the opportunity.

Chairman OWENS. Our next panel consists of Dr. Michael Webb, director of education, National Urban League; Dr. Michael B. Eisenberg, director ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, and chairperson of the ERIC Executive Committee; Ms. Linda Morra, director education and employment issues of the Human Resources Division, General Accounting Office; and Dr. Stanley D. Zenor, executive director, Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

While the panelists are being seated, I would like to take this opportunity to do some housekeeping.

The hearing today is a continuation of our hearing yesterday. I would like to say that we are directing the staff of the Subcommittee on Select Education to do an analysis of the accuracy of the Assistant Secretary's testimony as it relates to H.R. 4014, and this analysis will be placed in the record before her written statement.

We also would like placed into the record the letter that I referred to in yesterday's hearing as a letter in response to Drs. Patricia Graham and P. Michael Timpane.

[The letter follow:]

LETTER OF RESPONSE BY HON. MAJOR R. OWENS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Thank you so much for your letter of March 16, 1992. I welcome your suggestions with respect to the reauthorization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), but I am confused about the context of your comments about the creation of a "separate policy board" within OERI.

When Dr. Graham spoke with Lawrence Peters of my staff on the afternoon of Friday, March 13, 1992, she relayed some of these same concerns, but conceded that she had never actually read the text of the proposed reauthorization legislation itself (H.R. 4014) and was basing her remarks on a second-hand report of its contents. Given the short time since that conversation and your letter, as well as the fact that you make no specific references to the bill's language, I assume that you still have not had the opportunity to review H.R. 4014.

I believe it would be more appropriate and helpful to the subcommittee if you would address your comments to the actual language of the legislation. For this reason, I have enclosed a copy of the draft substitute to H.R. 4014 for your consideration and review.

In addition, I am puzzled by your reference to the National Council for Educational Research (NCER) under the National Institute of Education as a strictly advisory body. The authorizing statute for NCER did, in fact, give that body specific authority to "establish general policies for . . . the Institute." This, to my reading, is not a purely advisory role. It is useful to know, however, that neither you nor Dr. Graham found this body to be "obstructive" in your work at NIE.

I welcome any additional comments you may care to make with respect to the Research Policy and Priorities Board set out in H.R. 4014 and any other provisions of the legislation. Please do not hesitate to contact me or my staff.

Chairman OWENS. We also would like the chart—that was handed to the assistant secretary—comparing how other research and development entities make funding decisions, entered into the record.

[The chart follows:]

HOW OTHER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ENTITIES MAKE FUNDING DECISIONS

OERI NOW	OERI UNDER H.R. 4014	NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION	NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH	NEW AMERICAN SCHOOLS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
Peer review at Secretary's discretion Secretary has complete discretion in selection of grants, contracts, and the topics and areas in which grants and contracts are issued.	Peer review of all grants and contracts Before issuing an RFP or soliciting contract bids which exceed $500,000 in any single fiscal year, Secretary must submit the proposal to Board for review. Board must determine that that the proposed action is consistent with the Board's 5-year Research Policy and Priorities Plan before the RFP or solicitation could be issued. If the Board fails to review a proposal which has been transmitted by the Secretary at its next meeting, the Secretary could proceed without Board approval.	Peer review of all grants and contracts On the basis of peer review comments, NSF staff recommends grant and contract awards All grants or contracts which exceed $500,000 in any single year, or a total of $6 million, must be approved by the 21-member National Science Board.	Peer review of all grants and contracts Peer review panels recommend applications which are worthy of funding and assign each a priority rating. Peer review panel recommendations are then submitted for review and approval by each Institute's 18-member advisory council. The advisory council must approve all grants and contracts which exceed $50,000.	Peer review of all contract bids On the basis of peer review comments, NASDC staff and the Education Advisory Committee identify proposals worthy of funding. On the basis of these recommendations, NASDC President recommends proposals worthy of funding to the 21-member NASDC Board of Directors. The NASDC Board of Directors makes the final selection of proposals which are to be funded.

Chairman OWENS. We want to welcome the panelists here and remind you that your written testimony will be entered into the record in its entirety. You may use this time to highlight any special points you want to make. There will be a period for questions.

You may begin, Dr. Webb.

STATEMENTS OF MICHAEL WEBB, DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION, NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE, NEW YORK, NY; MICHAEL B. EISENBERG, DIRECTOR, ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON INFORMATION RESOURCES, AND CHAIRPERSON, ERIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, SYRACUSE, NY; LINDA MORRA, DIRECTOR FOR EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT ISSUES, HUMAN SERVICES DIVISION, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, DC; AND STANLEY D. ZENOR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY, WASHINGTON, DC

Dr. WEBB. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

I appreciate this opportunity to briefly comment on the America 2000 Special Community Assistance Program and to offer support.

The proposed delivery system would create a new vehicle for communities to benefit from research, development, and effective practice and would provide a catalyst for the coordination of a variety of efforts to improve education.

The Nation's movement toward national education goals, assessment, and certification has had an effect on the teacher pool, on decisions about what States and local communities will require be taught, and on the nature of the assessment to determine what students are learning. The reform movement has placed, and will increasingly place, stresses on an already exhausted system of public education. Throughout the Nation, parents, teachers, youth service providers, local and State policymakers, and administrators join a common refrain: "We are expected to do more with less, but where is the relief, and where is the national leadership?"

Too often the diverse and often disparate efforts to provide relief either work at odds with one another, do not reach those for whom succor is intended, or do not adequately address the need for which they were intended. Often these efforts, though well intended, drain valuable resources by duplicating services and programs undertaken more efficiently elsewhere.

The proposed District Agent Education Extension Program offers the potential for providing local communities with relief. The program would establish a district agent in economically distressed areas who would identify local efforts, resources, and services, and provide a mechanism for coordination. In general, even the poorest community possesses resources that are under-utilized.

Simply put, one of the major reasons for this is that people do not talk with one another and are often unaware of what various groups and institutions have to offer. The district agent could bring people together to develop a coordinated response to identify local needs. The agent could help to coordinate the resources of organizations and institutions outside the school, including the OERI labs and centers, universities, business, and industry, and Federal agen-

cies to begin to create a coherent plan for supporting public education reform.

Having expressed my support for the proposal, I would like to offer a few concerns. My first concern is that the leadership and direction of OERI have often lunged precariously in the direction of emerging political agendas. The inconsistency of the vision and leadership of OERI has hindered the office in its pursuit of the founding mission. The DAEEP should not become another vehicle for mobilizing local special interest groups in order to advance partisan political agendas.

Second, it is a mistake to assume that Federal, State, and local officials, as well as faculty of institutions of higher education and the business community understand the educational needs of students from economically poor backgrounds. Some do, and some do not. The DAEEP should not reinforce the practice of reshuffling existing alliances using the same playing cards. In order for the program to be genuinely effective, the district agent must establish and maintain meaningful relationships with local communities and community-based organizations and institutions.

Finally, one of the roles of the district agent should be to work with local organizations, businesses, and institutions to develop the resources to place information data bases in every school. While we live in an information age, the curriculum in most of our schools is based on books. Students and teachers should have direct access to the integral tools of the information society: namely, information systems. Most students, and particularly those in the economically poorest schools, are being denied access to information systems because of the inadequate funding of public education. One role of the district agent must be to create new funding opportunities for schools. In particular, ERIC must become a standard resource of schools.

Several years ago, many of us became excited at the announcement of the ERIC school disk. This product was intended to capture carefully selected full text information from the ERIC data base in order to eliminate the unwieldy processes that currently characterize access to ERIC. The disk would provide educators and students with an extensive array of curriculum resources to support teaching and learning in almost every subject, thus providing a low-cost enrichment of the school program. Once the disk is made available, if the disk is made available, it and the technology required to support it must be provided to public schools and particularly those in low-wealth areas.

In conclusion, the DAEEP, if adopted, could provide the answer to the question many have asked for the last 12 years: "Where is the relief, and where is the leadership?"

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Michael Webb follows:]

STATEMENT OF DR. MICHAEL WEBB, DIRECTOR, EDUCATION AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT, NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE, INC.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to comment on "The America 2000 Special Community Assistance Program." This proposed delivery system would create a new vehicle for communities to benefit from the results of research, development and effective practice, and would provide a catalyst for the coordination of a variety of efforts to improve education.

Though public education is undergoing radical changes, the changes are not always apparent to those on the front line of education: students, teachers and administrators. Those who lament in public forums that the effects of the reform movement have not touched their community are wrong. The Nation as a whole has passed the threshold of a new era. Changes in society occur slowly; the effects are often subtle and imperceptible.

The Nation's movement towards national education goals, assessment and certification has had an effect on the teacher pool, on decisions about what States and local communities will require be taught, and on the nature of the assessment to determine what students are learning. The reform movement has and will increasingly place stresses on an already exhausted system of public education. Throughout the Nation, parents, teachers, youth service providers, local and State policymakers and administrators join a common refrain, "we are expected to do more, with less, but where is the relief and where is the national leadership?"

Too often, the diverse and often disparate efforts to provide "relief" either work at odds with one another, do not reach those for whom succor is intended, or do not adequately address the need for which they were intended. Often, these efforts, though well-intended, drain valuable resources by duplicating services and programs undertaken more efficiently elsewhere.

The proposed District Agent Education Extension Program offers the potential for providing local communities with "relief." The program would establish a district agent in economically distressed areas who would identify local efforts, resources and services, and provide a mechanism for coordination. In general, even the poorest community possesses resources that are underutilized. Simply put, one of the major reasons for this is that people do not talk with one another and are often unaware of what various groups and institutions have to offer. The District Agent could bring people together to develop a coordinated response to identified local needs. The agent could help to coordinate the resources of organizations and institutions outside the school, including the OERI Labs and Centers, universities, business and industry and Federal agencies, to begin to create a coherent plan for supporting public education reform.

Having expressed my support for the proposal, I would like to offer a few concerns. My first concern is that the leadership and direction of OERI have often lunged precariously in the direction of emerging political agendas. The inconsistency of the vision and leadership of OERI has hindered the Office in its pursuit of the founding mission. The DAEEP should not become another vehicle for mobilizing local special interest groups in order to advance partisan political agendas.

Second, it is a mistake to assume that Federal, State and local officials, as well as faculty of institutions of higher education and the business community understand the educational needs of students from economically poor backgrounds. Some do and some do not. The DAEEP should not reinforce the practice of reshuffling existing alliances using the same playing cards. In order for the program to be genuinely effective, the District Agent must establish and maintain meaningful relationships with local communities and community-based organizations and institutions.

Finally, one of the roles of the District Agent should be to work with local organizations, businesses and institutions to develop the resources to place information data bases in every school. While we live in an information age, the curriculum in most of our schools is based upon books. Students and teachers should have direct access to the integral tools of the information society: information systems. Most students, and particularly those in the economically poorest schools, are being denied access to information systems because of the inadequate funding for public education. One role of the District Agent must be to create new funding opportunities for schools. In particular, ERIC must become a standard resource of schools.

Several years ago, many of us became excited at the announcement of the ERIC School Disk. This product was intended to capture carefully selected, full text information from the ERIC data base in order to eliminate the unwieldy processes that currently characterize access to ERIC. The Disk would provide educators and students with an extensive array of curriculum resources to support teaching and learning in almost every subject, thus, providing a low-cost enrichment of the school program. Once the Disk is made available, it and the technology required to support it, must be provided to public schools and particularly those in low-wealth areas.

The DAEEP, if adopted, could provide the answer to the question many have asked for the last 12 years: "Where is the relief, and where is the leadership?"

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Dr. Eisenberg.

Dr. EISENBERG. Thank you.

I appreciate this opportunity to bring you up to date on the progress of the ERIC system over the last few years and to explain how ERIC, as a system, is ready, willing, and able to make a significant contribution to SMARTLINE, USA-Online, the NREN, and other initiatives aimed at improving information access to educators, parents, and students.

I may be unique in some of my testimony in that I am going to say a lot of positive things about a Federal program—namely, the ERIC system. ERIC is, I am pleased to say, the most comprehensive education information system in the world. The mission of ERIC is very clear and very well defined. It is to meet the education information needs of educators, future educators, researchers, and parents, and sometimes even K-12 students.

To fulfill this mission, ERIC now offers an impressive array of services, products, and systems. ERIC offers direct response to user questions. Last year, the ERIC system had over 100,000 direct queries made to it. We have the ERIC data base, the largest education data base in the world, with over 750,000 records in it. Of the over 4,000 data bases that exist in our country today—and that keeps increasing every minute that we speak—ERIC is the third most used data base in the United States.

We also have outreach services to specific audiences. Last year, ERIC staff participated in over 600 professional association meetings and conferences, made over 350 presentations—that is almost one a day; there is probably an ERIC presentation going on today—sponsoring over 100 exhibits. Currently, over 500 professional education associations formally work with ERIC as partners to help their constituents obtain relevant education information.

User reaction to ERIC is very positive. I would like to just give a couple of anecdotal responses to the feedback to the Clearinghouse on Adult Career and Vocational Education. One was from a career counselor in private practice working with midlife adults. She noted, "I respect the quality and concise approach of your materials. Often I find the one- to two-page publications worthy of photocopying and giving to clients. Just wanted to let you know you were appreciated."

A training and education program manager with Goodwill Industries wrote, "The latest batch of information I just received was so excellent that it prompted me to write to thank you. The information available from ERIC is especially valuable to organizations like mine. ERIC resources always contain accurate, complete, succinct information. Replies to requests are always prompt and complete. I will continue to utilize ERIC's resources for program development, project planning, and staff training with pleasure."

There are more formal evaluations also available. I would like to just point out the fast response survey conducted in 1989 by NCES which found, of the four major OERI programs, ERIC was the most recognized OERI program; 82 percent of all respondents were familiar with ERIC, and they found that 67 percent of all school districts receive ERIC services and products.

Now while we are pleased with that to some degree, ERIC's system and personnel realize we can be doing even more. We should be reaching 100 percent of the schools, not just 67 percent of the schools. At a recent meeting of the ERIC directors and OERI

staff, the system came up with some of the following initiatives, and I would just like to point out a few. One is to place ERIC materials directly in schools and communities, the kind of thing that Dr. Webb was just talking about. For example, the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education has started to place ERIC on CD-ROM in some rural and Indian schools, directly in there. These CD-ROM systems are heavily used and very popular with administrators, teachers, and even students.

We also wish to move ERIC to the next level, and that is to provide the full text in electronic form and in print form of digests, documents, and articles. We need to go beyond the bibliographic nature of some of ERIC and deliver the full text.

We also feel that it is important as a system to provide education information services and products to users on electronic networks. ERIC's staff are already interacting with educators and researchers through the networks. We interact with users by the Internet and various other communication systems. We feel that ERIC can play a major role in providing network services to faculty, students, staff, and even parents through SMARTLINE, USA-Online, the NREN, and other systems.

In the limited time remaining to me, I just wish to clear up two lingering misconceptions that we seem to hear about ERIC and then to emphasize the capabilities of ERIC. One often voiced and erroneous statement is that ERIC is only for researchers and grad students. This is simply not true. Over one-half of the 100,000 direct requests last year came from building-level teachers and principals.

ERIC also produces a full range of products, and I will point out a few, and you tell me if they seem for researchers or they seem for parents. One here is: "What do parents need to know about children's television viewing?" Another says: "How can I be more involved in my children's education?" Another is: "What is a quality preschool program?"

We also have things like "Family Living: Suggestions for Effective Parenting," which is a collection of short articles and digests; "The School Leadership Handbook for Excellence;" and "Improving School-Community Connection for Poor and Minority Students." These are the type of synthesis products that the ERIC system has been coming up with for many years.

Misconception number two is that ERIC is just a data base, and an archival data base at that. Certainly the ERIC data base is the foundation for all the services and products that we provide. However, the ERIC data base is a gold mine of relevant and timely resources. It contains thousands of program descriptions, evaluations, curriculum, and instructional materials. Furthermore, the full range of services and products that I described really show that the ERIC system is a system and not just a bibliographic data base in its intent, its design, and its delivery.

In terms of the future, in addition to its own initiatives, ERIC is in a position to do whatever the Congress, the Department of Education, or OERI deem appropriate and useful. In many ways, ERIC is unique among the OERI entities. It is decentralized; there are 16 clearinghouses with subject expertise, services, and products direct-

ed at specific targeted audiences. But the system is also unified and coordinated in responding to the needs and new initiatives.

Clearinghouse staff work closely with the OERI staff and Robert Stonehill, the OERI director of ERIC, to respond to defined goals and new opportunities in a timely and highly competent fashion. The ERIC system spans the full range of information processing functions. We gather, we access and retrieve, we synthesize, and we communicate.

In closing, I will offer a personal note. I am an associate professor of information studies at Syracuse University. I can expend my time and effort in many different ways. In fact, we never lack for opportunities in the academic world. I can write, I do research, I teach as much as I'm willing to, I present at many conferences, I console. Time is my most precious resource. I never have enough time, and I think you all can relate to the same thing, and yet I choose to spend a significant portion of my time with the ERIC system. I do that because ERIC is highly meaningful, it is highly effective, and it is highly rewarding. ERIC works. Every day, my clearinghouse and others provide important services and products that make a difference. My ERIC work is as important to me as any other teaching or research activity that I could do.

Taxpayers' money is well spent in ERIC. I encourage you, the Congress, and OERI to invest new challenges and resources in ERIC.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Michael B. Eisenberg follows:]

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON INFORMATION RESOURCES
School of Education | School of Information Studies

Testimony
to the
Education and Labor Subcommittee on Select Education
U.S. House of Representatives

March 18, 1992

My name is **Michael B. Eisenberg**, and I am an Associate Professor of Information Studies at Syracuse University and Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources. I appreciate this opportunity to bring you up-to-date on the substantial progress of the ERIC system since the 1987 oversight hearing and to explain how ERIC is ready, willing, and able to make a significant contribution to SMARTLINE, USA-Online, NREN, and other initiatives aimed at improving information access and use by teachers, administrators, parents, and students.

There are many positive developments to report since the last ERIC oversight hearing. Working cooperatively, personnel in the sixteen Clearinghouses, system support components, and OERI ERIC Program offices provide expanded services and products to an increasingly diverse user population. Thus, I am able to report that ERIC, the Educational Resources Information Center, is the most comprehensive education information system in the world. ERIC is a national information network involving the Federal government, university-based and private contractors, commercial publishing and database services, and libraries and information service providers throughout the world. The mission of ERIC is to meet the education information needs of:

- teachers
- administrators
- other education practitioners (e.g., guidance counselors, librarians)
- education researchers
- parents
- college and university faculty

030 Huntington Hall | Syracuse, New York 13244-2340 | 315-443-3640 | FAX 315-443-5732 | BITNET: ERIC@SUVM

- students in undergraduate and graduate education training programs
- students in secondary schools
- practitioners in related fields (e.g., medicine, social service).

To fulfill this mission, ERIC now offers an impressive array of services, products, and systems for communications and dissemination. For example, to each of the user groups, ERIC offers:

- **direct responses to user questions**. Last year, the ERIC system responded to over 100,000 requests for information. Contact with ERIC is only a 1-800-USE-ERIC phone call away.

- **reference and retrieval services**. Services include literature searches, bibliographies, identification of popular documents, and referral to other information sources and providers.

- **the ERIC database**. The largest education database in the world, ERIC now contains over 750,000 records of documents and journal articles. Of the 5,600 computer databases available through over 850 vendors, ERIC was the third-most searched database in the country, the second-most searched database in academic libraries, and the most popular database used in public libraries. Online vendors report over 500,000 searches of ERIC in 1991, and several thousand university, school and public libraries already provide free computer access to ERIC via compact disc-read only memory (CD-ROM) systems).

- **multiple access points to the ERIC database**. Users can access the database in schools, libraries, district and regional centers, and even at home using low and high technologies (e.g., print and microfiche indexes, telephone connection to an online information service, CD-ROM).

- **outreach activities for specific audiences**. In the past few years, ERIC has worked hard to increase contact with practitioners through their associations. Last, ERIC staff participated in over 600 professional conferences and meetings, making 350 presentations, and sponsoring 100 exhibits. Currently over 500 professional organizations formally work as "Partners" with the ERIC system to help their constituents obtain relevant education information.

- **synthesis publications and targeted products**. Recognizing that user needs for information often vary in terms of comprehensiveness

and complexity, ERIC offers a full and diverse line of products. These include two-page digests of recent research findings and information on major topics (available in print and on computer systems in full-text), short pamphlets for parents, trends and issues papers, monographs, mini-bibliographies, pre-packaged computer searches, electronic bulletin boards, newsletters, *The ERIC Review* (new education journal), directories, and data files. In 1991, over 1.5 million ERIC products were distributed to the public.

User reactions to these ERIC services and products are highly favorable. Responses to a recent request for feedback from users of the Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education are indicative of the comments that all Clearinghouses receive:

- a career counselor in private practice working with mid-life adults noted, "I respect the quality and concise approach your materials... Often I find the 1-2 page publications worthy of photocopying and giving to clients or as handouts at workshops...Just wanted to let you know you are appreciated -- even by the silent ones."

- a training and education program manager with Goodwill Industries wrote, "The latest batch of information I just received was so excellent that it prompted me to write you this note to thank you and your staff for excellent services...The information available from ERIC is especially valuable to organizations like mine...ERIC resources always contain accurate, complete, succinct information...replies to my requests are always prompt and complete, too. I will continue to utilize ERIC's resources for program development, project planning, and staff training with pleasure."

- a senior citizen stated, "I think the services you provide are invaluable–reaching out to everyone who requests them...You were generous and prompt in sending me so much material. Please accept my thanks and warm good wishes for the meaningful job you all perform to so many."

- a district-level administrator commented, "We have appreciated receiving multiple copies of ERIC materials. We regularly share materials with the middle and high school vocational education instructors in our district -- approximately 60 teachers. Good feedback."

More formal evaluations also confirm users' favorable reactions to ERIC:

- A "Fast Response" survey conducted in 1989 by NCES found that of the four major OERI programs, ERIC was the most recognized: 82 percent of respondents were familiar with ERIC, and 67 percent of all school districts receive ERIC services and products.

- A recent survey conducted by Access ERIC of current and potential ERIC users (1,184 completed forms from the 3,600 sent to members of professional associations) found that 90 percent of responding school administrators (180 out of 202) were familiar with ERIC , as were just under two-thirds of the policymakers (39 out of 59 responding) and half the classroom teachers (82 out of 163 responding). In terms of accessibility to ERIC, 90 percent of those responding (708 out of 787) felt ERIC was accessible to them when they needed education information.

- In terms of specific services and products: online ERIC services were rated favorably by 88 percent of the 745 persons responding (the remaining 12 percent had never used ERIC online); and 99 percent of the 453 respondent rating ERIC's document coverage, found it excellent or good.

While pleased with the overall recognition and favorable response to ERIC activities, ERIC personnel are aware that we can be doing even more. At the last systemwide meeting in November, ERIC Directors and OERI staff reaffirmed our commitment to providing education information services to practitioners and acknowledged the need to do a better job of reaching teachers. Specific recommendations for immediate and long-term initiatives to accomplish this include:

- **to place ERIC materials directly in schools and communities**. For example, the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education has started to place ERIC on CD-ROM in some rural and Indian schools. These are heavily used and popular with administrators, teachers, and even students!

- **to provide the full-text of documents, digests, articles and other education information** through online, CD-ROM products, existing and developing national electronic networks. Practitioners need direct and easy access to the full-text of educational resources, and ERIC can meet this need.

- **to provide education information services and products to users on electronic networks**. Computer networking–locally, nationally, and internationally– is exploding faster than anyone imagined. ERIC staff are already interacting with educators and researchers through networks. In the future, ERIC can play a major role in providing network education information services to faculty, students and staff in education institutions at all levels. This includes an active role for ERIC in relation to SMARTLINE, USA-Online, and NREN.

- **to expand products that synthesize the research that can directly related to practice**. ERIC provides concise, understandable summaries of research and practice on key topics of interest to teachers and parents through digests and conclusion brochures. It is desirable to increase the number and dissemination of such products.

- **to expand coverage in the ERIC database to include commercial and non-print materials** (including books, computer software, statistical databases, video), and better and more systematic journal coverage.

Some of these initiatives can be accomplished through cooperative arrangements with commercial vendors, professional associations, or non-profit agencies, e.g., providing full-text ERIC resources. However, most of these important improvements are well beyond the capacity of existing budgets, e.g., increasing the number and dissemination of digests and conclusion brochures, placing ERIC resources directly in schools and communities, expanding direct user services to include interacting with teachers, students, and other users of electronic networks. This would be money well-spent and would directly fulfill stated Congressional and administration goals of disseminating information to practitioners.

In the limited remaining time, I wish to clear up two lingering misconceptions about ERIC and to emphasize the capabilities of ERIC.

One often-voiced and erroneous statement is that ERIC is only for researchers and graduate students. This is simply not true. Approximately *one-half* of the 100,000 annual requests for information to ERIC Clearinghouses and support components come from teachers and administrators. After the review activities of 1987 and the establishment of new contacts, the ERIC system committed itself to providing services and products to education practitioners and parents. And ERIC has done so. In fact, it was the ERIC system that proposed, in 1987, the creation of Access ERIC, a new system component designed to coordinate ERIC's outreach, dissemination, and referral services to practitioners and parents.

Requests from practitioners and parents to all ERIC components come via telephone, mail, electronic mail and in-person visits or at conferences. Teachers and administrators typically ask for information on exemplary programs or practices, curriculum or instructional approaches, research findings and statistics for decision-making, or explanations of educational terms or "hot topics." Parents often want to know about the potential impact of a certain factor on their children, what is meant by a particular new educational practice or development, or which federal, state, or local agencies to contact for a particular need, and ERIC is able to answer all these questions and more.

In addition, ERIC produces a full range of publications specifically targeted to administrators, teachers, and parents. *The ERIC Review*, ERIC Digests, monographs, and Conclusion Brochures reach hundreds of thousands of teachers, administrators, and policymakers. Sample titles indicate the high usefulness of these materials to these audiences:

- *The Teachers' Role in the Social Development of Young Children* (monograph published by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education)
- *Improving the School-Community Connection for Poor and Minority Students* (monograph published by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education)
- *What Do Parents Need to Know About Children's Television Viewing?* (Conclusion Brochure published by Access ERIC)
- *Family Living: Suggestions for Effective Parenting* (a collection of short, reproducible articles, on early education, care, and child development for parents of preschoolers, accompanied by ERIC digests and an ERIC search, published by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education)
- *Educating Homeless Children* (digest published by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education)
- *School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence* (monograph published by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management).

Misconception number two is that ERIC is "just" a database, and an archival database at that. Certainly the foundation for all ERIC services and products is its database, as noted, the largest database of educational information in the

world. However, the ERIC database is a "gold mine" of relevant and timely resources, containing thousands of program descriptions and evaluations, conference proceedings, curriculum materials, research studies, bibliographies, government reports and more. A majority of these materials directly relate to the daily concerns and interests of teachers, administrators and parents.

Furthermore, the full range of services and products described above clearly demonstrate that the ERIC system is more than just a database in intent, design, and active delivery. ERIC is highly successful in doing what it was intended to do.

In terms of the future, in addition to its own initiatives, ERIC is in a position to do whatever the Congress, the Department of Education, or OERI deem appropriate and useful. Working closely with representatives of the Clearinghouses and support services, Robert Stonehill, the OERI Director of ERIC, leads a program that is able to respond to directives, defined needs, and new opportunities in a timely and highly competent fashion. In many ways, ERIC is unique among OERI entities–it is decentralized for subject expertise, services, and product creation and delivery, but unified and coordinated in responding to needs and new initiatives. Each ERIC Clearinghouse has a unique expertise in relation to audience, subject area, and scope, but in contacts with individual or organizational users, every ERIC component assumes systemwide responsibilities. The Clearinghouses are committed to helping constituencies in each scope area and to working cooperatively to present a coordinated, national effort to disseminate educational information.

Again, ERIC is positioned to respond as a system to whatever initiatives the Department and Congress choose. We span the full range of information functions–gathering, access and retrieval, synthesizing, communicating. The taxpayers' money is well spent in ERIC. I encourage you to invest in new challenges and resources for ERIC.

In closing, I offer a personal note. As an associate professor of Information Studies, I can expend my time and effort in many different ways. Every day I am faced with new opportunities to teach, conduct research, write, present, and consult. Time is my most precious asset. Yet I *choose* to spend a significant portion of my time working in ERIC. Why? Because it is highly meaningful, highly effective, and highly rewarding. ERIC works. Every day, my Clearinghouse and others provide important services and products that make a difference. My ERIC work is as important as any other teaching or research activity that I could do. I am proud to be associated with ERIC.

Thank you.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Ms. Linda Morra.

Ms. MORRA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am pleased to be here today to discuss GAO's findings concerning the Department of Education's Research Library. Our review was mandated by the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1990, and we issued our report in April 1991.

The report addressed the scholastic and historic value of the Library's collection, the effectiveness of services it provides to education employees, and the public access to the Library. In addressing these specific issues, it became clear that the Library lacked a collection development policy specifying first its primary and other users and, second, its materials acquisition and preservation priorities and practices.

We recommended that the Secretary determine the Library's scope and responsibilities and, in line with that, assure timely completion of a mission statement and a collection development policy. Just last week, the Department approved a revised Library Mission Statement. Work on the collection development policy is continuing. Let me provide some details.

Education's Research Library is the major Federal education library. Library officials estimate that it contains from 250,000 to 300,000 volumes, including both contemporary and historical collections. The Library consists of a library section and the education reference center section, both of which report to the director, Office of Library Programs, in OERI. Our work focused only on the Library section.

According to the American Library Association and other library experts, a collection development policy is needed to make effective day-to-day decisions regarding acquisition and preservation of material. Such a policy helps assure that the library systematically takes into account the needs of users and the availability of resources for cataloguing and preserving services. Without this guidance, the Education Library's contemporary collection has been largely influenced by the interests of individual Secretaries of Education.

Also, the Library has accepted a wide range of gifts of library materials without considering their usefulness to Library users or whether the Library has sufficient resources to store and catalogue the materials. A collection development policy should specify the needs and the services to be provided for each user group designated in the Library's mission statement.

Turning to the value of the existing collections, we found that although the Library has never systematically inventoried or evaluated its entire collection, experts agree that the historical collections are quite valuable. For example, they said the Library contains unique materials on the Nation's nineteenth century educational system, including the education of the American Indian. They also describe the selection of early American journals and materials on the history of American colleges as excellent, and they ranked the textbook collection as one of the three or four best in the country.

Although the Library's collection is thus seen as having scholastic and historic value, a 1989 Department of Education staff survey

showed that the Library is underused. Although 63 percent of the respondents reported needing Library services in their work, only 42 percent had ever used the Library even once. Employees said that the Library's inconvenient location, away from the Department's headquarters, was one of the major reasons for its relatively low use.

In response to these concerns, in April 1990 the Department did set up a satellite library in the Department's headquarters building. Employees also said that their use of the Library was limited because it lacked needed materials, and expert opinions echoed this concern. Department officials said that the contemporary collection, rather than the historical one, was of most use to Department staff.

However, experts saw the Library's contemporary collections as less comprehensive than the historical collection and therefore less attractive to researchers. We found many potential users were unaware of the Education Library's collections and services. Also, problems in collection cataloguing and maintenance reduced the usefulness of the Education Library to those who do use it.

Education researchers and others outside the Federal Government who gather education information were generally unaware of the Library's various collections. Eleven of the 20 organizations we surveyed said their staffs rarely or never used the Library. Of the 11, seven said their staffs were unaware of the Library or its collections. Fifteen of the 20 organizations we surveyed, as well as library experts we contacted, said the Library needed to increase public access. They thought this could be done by better publicizing the Library's collections and services and improving dissemination of materials.

Finally, Library officials told us that about one-half of the Library's volumes are not catalogued and thus generally are not retrievable or not useful to users. The uncatalogued volumes include books in the historical and textbook collections as well as Education publications and other materials developed under federally funded grants. In addition, about 40,000 books in the historical and rare book collection are poorly maintained and preserved.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, we found that the Library is a potentially valuable source of information for education researchers, policy-makers, and others. However, lack of clear policies for collection development and weaknesses in collection cataloguing and preservation limit its usefulness. The Department is taking steps in line with our recommendations. It has established the Library's mission; it is working to define a collection development policy. Once that is done, the Secretary should make sure that resources budgeted are consistent with the revised mission and policy. The Secretary also reported to GAO in July that they plan to review the Library's role in the larger context of a national information network.

This concludes my testimony, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Linda Morra follows:]

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY BY LINDA G. MORRA
ON ACTIONS NEEDED TO IMPROVE THE USEFULNESS
OF EDUCATION'S RESEARCH LIBRARY

The Department of Education's Research Library is the major federal education library. Library officials estimate that it contains 250,000 to 300,000 volumes, including both contemporary and historical collections. It has special collections, including rare books, some of which date back to the 15th century. Although the Library has never systematically inventoried or evaluated its entire collection, experts agreed that the historical collections are very valuable. The contemporary collection was seen as less comprehensive and therefore somewhat less useful than the historical collection.

GAO found that the library needs a collection development policy to make effective day-to-day decisions regarding acquisition and preservation. Absent this policy, the Library's contemporary collection has been largely influenced by the interests of individual Secretaries of Education. Also the Library has accepted a broad range of gifts of library materials without considering the needs of its users or whether it had sufficient resources to properly catalog and preserve the materials.

Other factors limited the Library's usefulness. A 1989 Department survey of its staff showed that although 63 percent of respondents needed library services in their work, only 42 percent had used the Library. Reasons cited for their limited use were that the library did not have needed materials and that it was inconveniently located. Following the survey the Department set up a satellite library in the Department's headquarters building to improve accessibility.

Also, many organizations GAO contacted said they were unaware of the Library or its collections. They said the Library is a potential source for information such as historical and legislative documents and for accessing education data bases. They thought the Library's collections and services should be better publicized and that dissemination of materials should be improved.

Finally, Library officials told us that about one-half of the Library's volumes had not been cataloged, and thus generally were not retrievable and useful to users. In addition, about 40,000 books in the historical and rare book collections are poorly maintained and preserved.

The Department is taking steps in line with GAO's recommendation. To define a collection development policy, the Department had to first determine the Library's scope of responsibilities and complete revision of its mission statement. The mission statement has recently been approved and work is continuing on the collection development policy.

Mr. Chairman

I am pleased to be here today to discuss GAO's findings concerning the Department of Education's Research Library. As you know, our review was mandated by the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1990, Public Law 101-254, Section 9. We completed our work about a year ago and issued our report on the subject (Education's Library: Actions Needed to Improve its Usefulness) HRD-91-61) in April 1991.

The report addressed the (1) scholastic and historic value of the Library's collection, (2) effectiveness of services it provides to Education employees, and (3) need to expand public access to the Library. In addressing these specific issues it became clear that the Library lacked a collection development policy specifying (1) its primary and other users and (2) its materials' acquisition and preservation priorities and practices.

We recommended that the Secretary determine the Library's scope and responsibilities, and in line with that determination, assure timely completion of a mission statement and a collection development policy. Last week the Department approved a revised Library mission statement. Work on the collection development policy is continuing.

I will now provide some background on the Library and more detail on our findings.

BACKGROUND

Education's Research Library is the major federal education library. Library officials estimate that it contains 250,000 to 300,000 volumes, including both contemporary and historical collections. It has special collections, including rare books, some of which date back to the 15th century. The Library consists of the Library Section and the Education Reference Center Section, both of which report to the Director, Office of

Library Programs, in the Office for Educational Research and Improvement (OERI).

Our work focused on the Library Section, which maintains a major collection of books, periodicals and microforms and conducts routine library activities, such as acquisition, cataloging, circulation, interlibrary loans and reference services. We reviewed several existing studies of alternatives for improving public access to the Library. We interviewed representatives of 20 key education associations and library organizations as well as a researcher and librarians familiar with the Library's collections. We also reviewed a Department staff survey concerning staff use of the Library.

NEED FOR BETTER DEFINED
MISSION AND COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT POLICY

A mission statement and collection development policy, together, should form the basis for the Secretary of Education's decisions about the Library. However, at the time of our review the Library did not have a collection development policy and was revising its mission statement.

The Library needs to articulate a collection development policy. According to the American Library Association and other library experts, a collection development policy is needed to make effective day-to-day decisions regarding acquisition and preservation of materials. Such a policy would help assure that the library systematically takes into account the needs of its users and the availability of resources for cataloging and preservation services. Absent this guidance, the Library's contemporary collection has been largely influenced by the interests of individual Secretaries of Education. Also, the Library has accepted a broad range of gifts of library materials without considering their usefulness to library users or whether

the library had sufficient resources to store and catalog the materials.

A collection development policy should specify the needs and services to be provided for each user group designated in the Library's mission statement. Therefore, a clear mission statement is needed. At the time of our review an OERI Library Advisory Committee was revising the mission statement to better target library services and was also drafting a collection development policy.

As I noted earlier, the Department has approved a revised mission statement and work is continuing on the collection development policy. The Department also plans to review the Library's role in a larger context. In July 1991, the Secretary reported to GAO that various components within the Department, including the Library, could serve as the foundation for a national information network. He indicated that OERI was forming a group to assess educators' needs and determine how the various components could be structured to meet those needs. More recently, Department officials informed us that management changes within OERI had delayed the group's formation but the Department intends to convene the group once a Director for Library Programs is appointed.

SCHOLASTIC AND HISTORIC VALUE OF THE COLLECTIONS

Although the Library has never systematically inventoried or evaluated its entire collection, experts agree that the historical collections are very valuable. They said that the Library provides information unavailable even in other libraries with strong education collections. For example, they said the Library contains unique materials on the nation's 19th century educational system, including the education of the American Indian. They also described the selection of early American journals and materials on the history of American colleges as

excellent and ranked the textbook collection as one of the three or four best in the country.

USE BY DEPARTMENT STAFF

Although the Library's collection is seen as having scholastic and historical value, a 1989 Department staff survey showed that the Library is underused. Although 63 percent of the respondents reported needing library services in their work, only 42 percent had ever used the Library. Employees said that the Library's inconvenient location -- away from the Department's headquarters -- was one major reason for the relatively low use. In response to these concerns the Department set up a satellite library in the Department's headquarters building in April 1990.

Employees also said their use of the Library was limited because it lacked needed materials; expert opinions echoed this concern. Department officials said that the contemporary collection, rather than the historical one, was of most use to Department staff. However, experts saw the Library's contemporary collections as less comprehensive than the historical collection and therefore less attractive to researchers. The contemporary collection is less comprehensive because of a decline in acquisition of material during the mid-1950s and the mid-1980s, when the Library experienced several organizational and geographic changes.

MAJOR ORGANIZATIONS SEE NEED
TO IMPROVE PUBLIC ACCESS TO LIBRARY

Many potential library users were unaware of the Library's collections and services. Also, problems in collection cataloging and maintenance reduce the usefulness of the Library to those who do use it.

Education researchers and others outside the federal government who gather education information were generally unaware of the Library's various collections. Eleven of the 20 organizations we surveyed said that their staffs rarely or never use the Library. Of the 11, 7 said their staffs were unaware of the Library or its collections.

Fifteen of the 20 organizations we surveyed as well as library experts we contacted said the Library needed to increase public access. Several organizations pointed to difficulties staffs have in obtaining needed information, such as historical and legislative documents and accessing education data bases. The Library is a potential source for such information and expanding its public accessibility would likely improve users' abilities to obtain needed data. They thought access could be improved by better publicizing the Library's collections and services and improving dissemination of materials. For example, they suggested publishing bibliographies of Library materials and summaries of the research available through the Library.

Finally, Library officials told us that about one-half of the Library's volumes are not cataloged, and thus generally are not retrievable and useful to users. The uncataloged volumes include books in the historical and textbook collections as well as Education publications and other materials developed under federally funded grants. In addition, about 40,000 books in the historical and rare book collections are poorly maintained and preserved.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, we found that the Library is a potentially valuable source of information for educational researchers, policy makers, and others. However, lack of clear policies for collection development and weaknesses in collection cataloging and preservation limit its usefulness. The Department is taking steps in line with our recommendation. It has

established the Library's mission and is working to define a collection development policy. Once that is done the Secretary should make sure that resources budgeted are consistent with the revised mission and policy.

This concludes my testimony Mr. Chairman. I would be happy to answer questions.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you.

Mr. Stanley Zenor.

Mr. ZENOR. Thank you, Congressman Owens.

As my written testimony focused primarily on USA-Online and SMARTLINE, so will my comments. I would prefer to be brief in my comments so that perhaps we will have the opportunity for dialogue following.

As we look at the proposed legislation or what OERI has proposed for SMARTLINE, I immediately see an issue of access and equity being raised. Mr. Ballenger alluded to those in his questioning to Mr. Komoski earlier in that an overwhelming number of our schools do not have the infrastructure necessary to take advantage of the electronic data that either system proposes to provide. There is no doubt that, as we seek to improve the schooling of our Nation's students, we need to provide more and better data to our teachers, administrators, and to the parents that are becoming involved in the process. However, simply putting it on to a system does not get it into the hands of the individuals that need it.

The members of my Association are the library and media specialists in public schools, the individuals that work with teachers and the administrators and the parents in their districts to assist in locating learning materials, assist in the integration of these materials in the classroom. They would be, and they are identified in the legislation, as one of the points of entry for this data into the schools, the libraries.

However, in talking with my members, it is apparent that very few elementary schools even have a telephone line within the library. Without a telephone line, you have no way to get to the outside world to access a data base. Those that may have a telephone line do not necessarily have the computer equipment with the telecommunications hardware and software necessary to link up to a network.

We fare somewhat better in high schools in that most high schools do have access to outside telephone lines, do have more computers than are found in elementary schools, but it is not the majority case even in the high school.

I had the opportunity last week to address a convention of my members in the State of Indiana, and at the conclusion I asked them three or four questions. I asked them how many of their libraries had outside telephone lines, and, out of a group of about 500 at this particular session, fewer than 200 raised their hands. When I asked of those 200, how many of them were in the high schools, most hands stayed up; how many were in the elementary schools? most hands went down. I further asked if they had the equipment, and it was apparent that the equipment does not exist.

I took the opportunity yesterday to call a person in the Madison Metro School District from Congressman Klug's district to ask what their capability was, because Madison is a very progressive and a very good school district. Up to this point, they have not had the capabilities in their libraries to access outside data bases. Currently, the hardware exists and is sitting in a closet. They are negotiating with the telephone company in Madison to provide the service into the buildings.

One problem that buildings in our schools face in terms of declining budgets is that the local telephone companies prefer to think of a school as a business and build their telephone usage at business rates rather than home or consumer rates, three or four times the cost of what you or I may pay for our residence phone. If we expect our administrators to have access to the information, perhaps we should think in terms of having a telephone in every classroom so that the teacher, at the moment of need when working with students, can call up USA-Online, or SMARTLINE, or whatever data base necessary to locate the information to solve the particular instructional problem that they are dealing with.

Can you imagine the cost, what it will take, the infrastructure that it will take to support putting in telephones even if we just do it in every school library, let alone in every classroom?

Now, obviously, the richer districts in the country have access to some of this technology and have access to telephone lines. I suspect that in Congressman Owens' district that is not the case, and I attempted to call one of my members in your district yesterday, and they were busy, working with their students and their teachers, and couldn't answer my question for me; and, Mr. Ballenger, the rural schools, the rural districts face the same situation; they do not have the money, and when it comes time for administrators to make decisions in their schools of where they spend money, telephone lines, telecommunications, access to the outside world are not always of the highest priority.

If we intend to provide this information, in whatever form, whether it is USA-Online, or SMARTLINE, or in a private partnership with something like Prodigy or Compuserve, we have to provide the infrastructure in our schools for those individuals to take advantage of that.

Additionally, the Department of Education has characterized their request for SMARTLINE as creating a system that will be user friendly, will integrate several data bases into one system. Searching electronic data bases requires a certain amount of skill and expertise. A teacher could put in a request for information on how to teach fractions to fourth-grade students and receive hundreds of citations of studies, reports, conference papers, et cetera, but then what happens? They have to be able to find that information. With advanced skills, they could say teaching fractions to fourth grade students or in inner cities at a particular learning level, et cetera, but you have to narrow it down; you can be inundated with the information that comes out of systems such as ERIC until you know some of the strategies involved.

Within the schools, the library media specialist is the person that works with the teachers and administrators, knows how to search and define those questions, help that teacher define those questions, so that instead of 400 maybe they get four very, very specific, germane citations or full-text references that they need. Without those individuals to assist in the process, it becomes difficult. Once you have the citations, you have to find and retrieve the material; once you have the material, you have to determine how to integrate it into the curriculum and make it work with your particular students in a particular situation. Simply providing information does not solve the problem that I think we are attempting to deal

with in the legislation or in the Department of Education's OERI SMARTLINE proposal.

I also talked to a member in Congressman Cunningham's district yesterday to ask them about their situation and told them what I was doing today and that I would be talking with you about SMARTLINE, USA-Online, and described what those two things were to them, and their response was back to me: "That sounds an awful lot like ERIC, doesn't it?" to which I had to admit, yes, it does.

I suggested in my written testimony that, rather than funding the development of new data bases, new services, that perhaps we would all be better served by charging ERIC to do the things that SMARTLINE proposes to do and to direct some of that funding into providing the infrastructure so that our schools and our public libraries can provide the services and have the outlet to provide the services for the people that need that information and want that information.

I thank you for the opportunity and look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Stanley D. Zenor follows:]

STATEMENT OF STANLEY D. ZENOR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY

Thank you for the opportunity to appear today to express the Association for Educational Communications and Technology's view on the reauthorization of OERI, and in particular on the technology component contained in the reauthorization. The Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) is a national professional association representing members working at all levels of education. AECT members are involved in the improvement of instruction through the systematic application of instructional technology to the learning process.

I want to state that AECT strongly supports legislation that will increase the application of instructional technology in our Nation's schools. Instructional technology provides a means of changing what happens in the classroom, a means of creating equity in education, and a means of providing access to a wide variety of information resources.

Instructional technology is not a computer, satellite dish, or piece of educational software. Instructional technology is a process that involves the application of learning theory, educational hardware and software, internal and external resources, and evaluation to a desired learning outcome. Through the application of instructional technology, learning situations can be created to meet the unique and individual needs of multiple learners within the same classroom. The process of instructional technology assists teachers and school administrators in modifying the classroom curriculum and developing new classroom curricula to meet the rapidly changing needs of today's schools.

I am pleased that the legislation being discussed today and the OERI budget request recognizes the integral roles instructional technology and the Library Media Center have in the improvement of our Nation's schools and education of our students. The mission of the Library Media Center, staffed by professional Library Media Specialists, is to provide the services and support necessary to integrate instructional technology in the school's curriculum, serving students, teachers, and administrators.

Both H.R. 4014 and the reauthorization request of OERI recognize that as schools search for ways to improve, a wide variety of information is needed to guide their efforts. H.R. 4014 and its provision for "USA Online" and the administration's OERI reauthorization request containing its provision for SMARTLINE share the common goal of developing a system for the dissemination of information that can be used by teachers, administrators, parents, and the general public to improve the learning of today's students. The approaches proposed, however, appear to differ greatly. Additionally, it appears that neither H.R. 4014 or the OERI proposal take into account the infrastructures necessary to support the proposed systems.

The issues of educational access and equity must be addressed during the course of discussion on this legislation. Many schools, particularly elementary schools, do not have an outside telephone line in the Library Media Center. Additionally, many schools do not have computer equipment for telecommunications in the Library Media Center. Without these two basic pieces of technology, teachers, administrators, parents, and students will be denied access to the electronic data bases being proposed.

Many districts do not yet have full-time Library Media Specialists in their schools, particularly elementary school level. The absence of a full-time professional in the Library Media Center creates another obstacle in the utilization of the proposed electronic data bases. Although "USA-Online" and SMARTLINE are envisioned as being user-friendly, individuals using either system will need assistance. It takes specialized skill to search an electronic data base to locate specific information within the massive holdings of any data base. Asking the data base for information on teaching fractions to elementary students could result in hundreds of citations. Successful data base searching requires specialized skills—skills that Library Media Specialists have and can teach to other users. Locating the appropriate citations or information within a data base is, however, only the beginning of the process.

Once the citations are identified, the full text of the citation reference is generally needed. This will entail either retrieving it in the form of hard copy, or locating it using an advanced feature of an electronic data base. Once the information is retrieved, it must be integrated into the school's curriculum, and resources to support the curriculum change must be created or acquired. The information must be put into use if it is going to have any effect upon improving the education of our students. To accomplish this requires an infrastructure that many of our schools do not currently have.

We already have an outstanding electronic data base system serving education in the form of ERIC. The basic mission of ERIC is to collect and disseminate information pertaining to education. ERIC serves a wide constituency that includes teachers, administrators, researchers and students. In addition to its electronic data base, ERIC provides a wide range of customized services including specialized bibliographies, digests and reports on specialized and often requested topics. In addition to providing this information as a result of routine requests, this information is also disseminated to educators through professional association publications and presentations at conferences and conventions. I would like to suggest that the existing resources of ERIC be utilized as the core of any electronic data base dissemination system developed in the form of "USA-Online" or SMARTLINE. It would appear that by utilizing ERIC, funding that might otherwise be used to develop graphical interfaces between multiple data bases and the creation of new data bases could be used to further the dissemination of information about teaching and learning to teachers, school administrators and parents. Rather than funding the development of new electronic networks, funding could be directed at providing the basic infrastructure necessary, such as telephone lines, the appropriate computer hardware and equipment to assure access to the data base in not only our country's richest schools but also in the schools where the information need is probably the greatest—our underfunded and underfinanced schools. Additionally, the available funding could also be directed at providing the necessary support staff within our schools to assist teachers, administrators and parents in utilizing this information.

The goal of providing a data base of information on teaching and learning for educators and parents is clearly a positive step in the process of improving the education of our students. We must, however, do more than simply provide the information. We must be certain that the infrastructures are available to make the information accessible and to translate the information into action in order to have a positive impact upon the education of our students today and in the future.

Chairman OWENS. I thank you.

Let me start with you, Mr. Zenor. What is your reaction to the EPIE system which was described before? Did you hear the previous witness?

Mr. ZENOR. Yes, and I have been acquainted with EPIE as an educator for over 20 years, and it is an outstanding organization and has reliably provided evaluation of hardware in its earlier years and now software instructional materials to the education community. I think, as Mr. Komoski pointed out, there is a great deal of educational software that exists that is untested. We have no idea

whether it is good or bad, yet our schools spend money on it. You all, I'm sure, in your offices have experienced the same thing simply buying a piece of software for your PC. You buy it without knowing what you get, and sometimes it is good, and sometimes it is bad.

Schools cannot afford to buy bad software; we cannot afford any longer for our students to use untested, unproven software. Schools need access to that information. As Ken suggested, EPIE could, through an electronic data base system, guide their purchases so that we provide the best opportunities for our students to achieve.

Chairman OWENS. Do you have any examples of schools, local education agencies, that are models in the use of electronic communications and take advantage fully of networks in existence?

Mr. ZENOR. Yes. One that immediately comes to mind is Cherry Creek High School, which is in suburban Denver, Colorado.

Chairman OWENS. Cherry Creek?

Mr. ZENOR. Cherry Creek. It is an exemplary school in terms of use of technology, media utilization within the library, external data base utilization by teachers and students.

Norfolk, Virginia, is also——

Chairman OWENS. That is closer.

Mr. ZENOR. It is a little closer.

Let's see. I could certainly come up with a list for you, Mr. Chairman, if you would like.

Chairman OWENS. We would appreciate that.

Mr. ZENOR. Okay.

Chairman OWENS. If you could give us a list of situations which are good examples, models.

Chairman OWENS. Dr. Eisenberg, Mr. Zenor said that ERIC may be already doing most of what SMARTLINE is trying to do. Would you comment on that?

Dr. EISENBERG. Having heard Mr. Komoski speak, I see the desirability of bringing even more than the ERIC does into an electronic one-stop kind of process. I don't think it matters as much whether we call it ERIC or SMARTLINE or USA-Online, or whatever. The point is that educators in our schools, future educators, parents, or whatever, should be able to go to one place and get the electronic information that is funded by the government, that is available through commercial means and whatever; not to recreate, but to bring together the electronic resources.

The ERIC system has already put together the bibliographic data base. With our digests and our digests on line, we have made a start at the synthesis kinds of things. If there are other type data bases that are necessary, that are not in existence, I think the ERIC system can make a great contribution to that. So regardless of how it all plays out, I think the ERIC services and products data bases have to be the backbone of something like SMARTLINE.

I would, by the way, echo that our users are screaming for direct product type information and data bases as well, that is an important need also, and examples—you just asked for an example of good practice in terms of technology and whatever.

Quince Orchard, by the way, in Maryland, is a school where the students even dial up at night and access the data bases in the library media centers. That kind of information on practice and

whatever are data bases that we can build and also put into the SMARTLINE.

Chairman OWENS. I, as a librarian, am quite familiar with the wonders of ERIC. I think it represented real vision at the Federal level more than 20 years ago, and then that vision faltered and they began to neglect it. But for the benefit of my colleague who is a businessman, can you just tell us a little bit about the cost of ERIC? How much is borne by the Federal Government and how much is not supplied?

Dr. EISENBERG. Well, ERIC is unique in some ways. I believe the Federal funding is around $6 million, give or take, for 16 clearinghouses, for a centralized access ERIC unit in Washington. So what the ERIC clearinghouses do is sift through all the possible information that is available in reports and documents and things like that and decide which are the best.

There is a quality control aspect of ERIC in that we reject things we deem are not appropriate, perhaps not timely or timeless, that are not stated well or their conclusions are not adequately supported. Then that is made into an electronic data base which vendors—Dialog Information Services, BRS, GTE, and others—put up and sell time at a fairly low rate, because it is government supported. I'm not sure about the connect time, but it is in the $20 range versus $80 and $100 and $150 for more the medical and engineering data bases and things like that. So there is that aspect of the support for the dissemination of ERIC information through commercial means.

We also have these partnerships and adjunct clearinghouses which get their money from external sources as well. So there is a nice balance in the ERIC system between the public supported and the private. But $6 million doesn't go very far.

Chairman OWENS. Did you say $6 million or $60?

Dr. EISENBERG. Six point—$6 million.

Chairman OWENS. Six million dollars. Let the record show he is saying $6 million.

Dr. EISENBERG. Yes.

Chairman OWENS. For $6 million, you get a system which, incidentally, is used worldwide by educators.

Dr. EISENBERG. Not only used worldwide but valued. Don Ely, associate director of our clearinghouse, has traveled worldwide and he will tell you. You go into Peru and they will have an older ERIC collection, not even an updated one, and they guard it, and they hoard it as this treasure that provides them the information they need, because in some ways it is the only education information they have. It would be a wonderful foreign policy tool for us to be able to give ERIC data bases and systems worldwide.

Chairman OWENS. But the United States Information Service has ERIC in all of their centers across the world.

Dr. EISENBERG. That is correct.

So the ERIC system is a bargain for $6 million. First of all, the question answering, the creation of the range of products, the 750,000 entries in the system, but we could do so much more. We are not satisfied; we have only answered 100,000 questions last year. If we had an 800 number for every ERIC clearinghouse, we could probably quadruple that; if we had a system where we em-

phasized the user services, if, as Dr. Webb talked about, we were linked to extension agents that were out there and knew and were able to do it.

If something like SMARTLINE is available to library media specialists so that they can pull the ERIC material that they need and then make it available to teachers, then it works as the unified system of information dissemination.

Chairman OWENS. In truth, though, you are not doing all this for $6 million. What do the universities contribute?

Dr. EISENBERG. Rig'ıt. There are contributions on each side. At our own university there is the contribution of the space, the facilities, the time for faculty, and whatever. I don't have the figures on that personally, but there is a tremendous amount that is supported just by the infrastructure and the agencies that the ERIC clearinghouses are in. I stand corrected.

Chairman OWENS. We estimated at one time that they contribute at least as much as the Federal Government, the matching funds and sometimes even greater.

Dr. EISENBERG. With the matching aspect of it.

Chairman OWENS. The Federal $6 million has been parlayed into this magnificent system that already exists, and then Access ERIC, could you explain a little bit more about that?

Dr. EISENBERG. Yes. In 1987, the ERIC directors actually said, you know, "We can do more on the outreach side; we need more of a one-stop shopping kind of unit, component," and that was picked up by OERI, and it was funded as a one-stop, dial 1-800-USE-ERIC, and anybody can get in touch with the ERIC system and then coordinate activities and whatever.

They are funded—I'm not sure of the exact figure; I believe it is in the $350,000 range annually. That is within, by the way, the $6 million that I was talking about; that includes Access ERIC, the processing facility, the entire system. And Access ERIC is just starting to get going in terms of being utilized and recognized in the ways that we envision. They have created some very useful data bases. There is now a directory of education information providers for the entire country that people have access to.

Access ERIC, again, has the 800 phone number, but if someone calls Access ERIC, let's say, from your district and they have a question about early childhood education and the expert is in Illinois, because that is the ERIC clearinghouse on early childhood, there is no way to shift that person over. We have to say, "Well, you have to call them," and it is a long-distance phone call. Access ERIC does what it can.

Access ERIC coordinates the creation of the conclusion brochures which are the ERIC system's effort to sift down the information and make it available to parents in a concise manner and in a manner that meets their needs. They have coordinated the publication of the conclusion brochures. That is one of the major activities we see there.

On a personal note, my wife is a pediatric nurse-practitioner, and she can't keep the conclusion brochures in her office because they are immediately gobbled up by the parents. She has a full array of them out there. One proposal was, if we had the funding to produce enough conclusion brochures to put in every pediatric office in this

country, we would be able to get out there and reach education information for parents.

Chairman OWENS. Dr. Webb, given the enormous problems faced by inner city communities and the communities served by the Urban League, do you think ERIC has any relevance in helping us with those problems?

Dr. WEBB. Certainly ERIC definitely has relevance in solving those problems. One of the problems is that there is a lack of information about many kinds of services and strategies that could be used to impact on the problems, and ERIC is very remote in terms of the perception of many of the people we serve in our communities, and the reasons for that are, as mentioned earlier by another person, the fact that the technology does not exist in many of our communities. We certainly don't have a modem, sometimes a telephone, and certainly not a computer in many cases to use software necessary to access ERIC, Compuserve, and other data bases.

We are considering a proposal called Centers of Excellence, where we would establish community centers in communities throughout the Urban League network where there would be an infrastructure. They would be supported locally, and students, parents, anyone, would be able to go there to find information about parenting, about health, about education, tutoring, those kinds of things.

Chairman OWENS. Do all center city communities have libraries?

Dr. WEBB. Yes, most do.

Chairman OWENS. Are libraries possible candidates for these Centers of Excellence?

Dr. WEBB. Well, of course they are candidates. The problem that we run into is a problem we run into when we are trying to work with the schools, that you can't get in there past five o'clock, they are only open 3 days a week. These kinds of problems caused by the budget create difficulties in articulating with public institutions like libraries and schools.

Chairman OWENS. You had mentioned—and I do thank you for your support of the District Education Agent Program concept—but you mentioned that there is a problem that they might be misused for the mobilization of special interest groups. Would you care to elaborate on that a little bit?

Dr. WEBB. Yes. For example, I formerly was a part of the ERIC community as associate director at the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. I have been associated since 1980 with ERIC, and over the years I have seen a number of shifts that have been the result of thinking of people who have come into the administration to try to shift the country to some political agenda.

My point is simply that I don't see this program of outreach as a political tool to organize anyone around any other reason than to improve the quality of life, the quality of services that are provided in particular communities, especially those communities in greatest need. So I guess my major point was that this effort should be a nonpartisan effort and that it should focus mainly on the goal of improving life, the quality of life in those communities.

Chairman OWENS. Yes, your recommendation is well taken. I think the bill should make sure we have some safeguards against any misuse of that component of H.R. 4014.

Ms. Morra, we have a National Library of Agriculture, we have a National Library of Medicine. Are these constructs obsolete? Why is it so difficult to get an investment of time and attention and funds in the National Library of Education? Did you run across any data or any thinking that deemed that national libraries like this might be obsolete as a resource for a particular group of professionals or a particular function they are serving?

Ms. MORRA. The Library, we found, is certainly in a sorry state.

Chairman OWENS. The library where?

Ms. MORRA. The Education Library is in a sorry state and bears little resemblance to the kind of information center that your bill describes.

The Education people themselves think that part of the problem that they face has been the number of changes that that Library has undergone through the years, the number of changes in its location from first being outside HEW, being brought into HEW, being in NIE, undergoing several changes within the Department of Education itself. They think that that has hurt the attention to the Library, as you are more concerned about just getting the Library operating in the face of so many moves.

We also note that in terms of budget from 1980 to 1990—and this is using 1980 dollars—the resources have decreased by 62 percent that have gone to the Education Library.

Chairman OWENS. The resources have decreased by 62 percent since when?

Ms. MORRA. From 1980 to 1990.

Chairman OWENS. Sixty-two percent?

Ms. MORRA. Yes.

Chairman OWENS. Thanks.

Ms. MORRA. And the folks that we talked to in the Library certainly feel that part of the reason they are in the situation they are in is because of the lack of staff and the lack of dollars.

Chairman OWENS. Do you have any recommendations for what might be an adequate budget for the Library?

Ms. MORRA. They are requesting this year or planning to spend $500,000.

Chairman OWENS. What is the present budget?

Ms. MORRA. Three hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, and the additional moneys, the large majority of it is going for a technical assistance contract to help them preserve that deteriorating collection, help them catalogue that half of the collection that is not currently catalogued and accessible. Certainly if you are going to maintain any kind of library, it seems that those are things that need to be done.

We raise the issue in our report of whether, given the current status, without any extra attention going to this, the historical collection should even continue to be housed in Education's Library, and currently, as we indicated, the contemporary collection is thought to be inadequate. So without something, those issues would have to be addressed. So at least the technical contract is an attempt to do something.

We also see the Secretary, as I indicated, following our recommendations of doing a mission statement, and as of last week they do have a mission statement. The mission statement at least sets

out what the Library is doing as the prior draft did but does set out what they think it should do, but we see that the mission statement still lacks a statement of priorities.

Chairman OWENS. You have seen the mission statement? Does it have any reference to SMARTLINE and any relationship that that Library might have to SMARTLINE?

Ms. MORRA. No, I think it does not get that specific. We would hope for more specifics in the collection development policy. We would hope that it spells out more of what the policy is, who they see as the Library's users, what services they think should be provided to those users, and what the priority of use is.

Chairman OWENS. But most of the increase that is anticipated would go toward this technical assistance contract? They don't propose to provide any more professional librarians, for example? Do you think they have an adequate number of professional librarians on staff?

Ms. MORRA. They currently have 15 people, I believe; eight in the main library and the research service, two in the satellite library, and I think five are in the reference section.

Chairman OWENS. Are they professionals you are talking about, or clerks?

Ms. MORRA. I believe those are professionals.

I don't believe that they have identified more staff currently in the budget as most critical. The staff we talked to believed that they could use more people. We do not at this point have an opinion on that.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ballenger.

Mr. BALLENGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Zenor, considering the obvious lack of capabilities because of no phones and no computers and so forth, to be able to use ERIC, what type of installation cost would be involved in a school? I don't know if you need to have a fiber-optic line, or can you use copper lines?

Mr. ZENOR. ERIC is available in a variety of ways. Besides being on line, you can get it on CD-ROM, which requires a computer and a CD-ROM drive. That is in the neighborhood of $2,000 per workstation. You can also get ERIC in microfiche and microfilm. I don't know what the collection costs like that.

Mike.

Dr. EISENBERG. Well, it varies by the level of access you want, but I will give you a ball park figure. Let's say you wanted to put the ERIC data base itself in every school in the country. If every school were given an ERIC data base, a CD-ROM station right there—I'm talking about the data base itself, not the equipment; I mean most schools have the computers—we could do that for $10 million tomorrow.

Chairman OWENS. For every school?

Dr. EISENBERG. For every school in the country. You have about, what, 75,000 or 100,000 schools. We could probably contract with one of the vendors to create a CD-ROM at that size of a contract for maybe $100 or $150 or something like that for each school, where we could give them the disk that would put ERIC in the hands of every school in the country. They would have to provide

the computer and the computer station. The problem is not usually a computer; you need a CD-ROM drive. That would give them the ERIC data base itself. That would not necessarily give all those other things that we would need.

But ERIC right now is not SMARTLINE, it is not electronically, technologically based on high tech. We would recommend, in fact, that this effort to disseminate education information in the schools span low tech all the way through high tech. I mean why shouldn't we have enough funds to put ERIC digests, a full set of ERIC digests, in every school? That is synthesized, sifted out information you pay per form. We don't have the funds to produce those kinds of numbers.

Mr. BALLENGER. Let me ask you a question. As a businessman, in my own company we are redoing our own computer. We have got Hewlett-Packard; everything is Hewlett-Packard. We went to the 9000 series, and it turns out that everything I have got aside from that is not worth anything, you can't even trade it in, and yet we have 25 CRT's, and we have got two additional computers that work beautifully. They say they will take them, but they are going to junk them or something like that.

Is it not possible to take some equipment like that, that has no value? I would be happy to give it to the school system if it was usable. Can I pose that question to anybody? Does it make sense? I mean I'm sure this has got to be happening all over the country, every time you upgrade your computer, that what you had is no longer of value.

Mr. ZENOR. Yes, you are right. To make the blanket statement that every piece of computer equipment that gets obsoleted through the upgrade process is going to be usable in a school is too much to say, because there reaches a point when you can't maintain it any longer due to age or accessibility. But many companies that have gone through and upgraded from the very first IBM PC or from a 286 PC to the next levels up, and there are schools that would love to have those for use by teachers and students.

Your particular HP I am not familiar with, Mr. Ballenger. I suspect, however, that there are, at the very least, community and junior colleges in North Carolina that are still using the HP 9000. At the public school level, I don't know.

Dr. EISENBERG. I would say that one of the reasons that companies upgrade is because of the maintenance costs.

Mr. BALLENGER. Maintenance costs and also the speed that is necessary and the number of CRT's that you can have.

Dr. EISENBERG. Right, off of one machine.

Mr. BALLENGER. That is right.

Dr. EISENBERG. For stand-alone PC's there is absolutely no problem, and schools would welcome them, but once you start in with a system, you have system management and maintenance, that becomes counterproductive. Also, some of those systems were proprietary operating systems and whatever, whereas the main educational software would not run on those things that are available. So there is a bit of a problem in the technical side of it.

Mr. BALLENGER. Oh, no. We programmed our own system and bought everything to fit the cost accounting system and inventory controls and pricing.

Dr. EISENBERG. But the DOS systems and the mainstream class ports, the IBM DOS systems and Macintosh, even the Apple II systems that people might be accessing from business and whatever, certainly schools would be able to use them.

But let me turn it around and say it another way. We want the best schools in the world—right?—competitive advantage and the whole thing, so we are going to give them yesterday's technology?

Mr. BALLENGER. If yesterday's technology doesn't cost anything and we have to borrow the money from the Japanese to pay for it, maybe yesterday's technology is better than nothing.

Dr. EISENBERG. Yes, it may be better than nothing, but it is still not going to put high tech—you know, we talk about investing in America's future in schools and all that, so we are going to give them a cast-off. That really concerns me.

Chairman OWENS. Would the gentleman yield for a minute?

Mr. BALLENGER. Sure.

Chairman OWENS. I think the distinction ought to be made here between computers that are going to be used to teach students how to use computers and computers that are going to be used to access information by libraries and by teachers. It seems to me that age is not as important there. Would that be a distinction?

Dr. EISENBERG. Well, again, what is the biggest problem with teaching? They have too many students and not enough time to work and whatever, and slower machines that are not giving them—if you ever sat down and used the Prodigy interface, it is so slow, particularly on the slower machines; you can wait forever. I would rather have a teacher who is, you know, between classes and needs a quick piece of information be able to get it quickly so that they can go back to the classroom. There is an efficiency question too, I think, that relates to that. It is a matter of weighing the investment of time and effort to use that technology.

Mr. BALLENGER. Two years ago, this thing was worth $50,000. I don't know what it is worth—it is not worth anything now. It is not worth anything to me, but it might be worth something to the school system, and if it is sensible to ask the school system if they would like to have it——

Dr. EISENBERG. I'll tell you what the school systems could use technology-wise; they could use the microfiche readers that industries are discarding, because they don't use microfiche because everything is on CD–ROM. They can use that for catalogues from libraries that are available on microfiche, for ERIC microfiche, and whatever. That is a piece of technology that schools would welcome. It doesn't always have to be the high-tech side in order to get people the information they need.

Mr. BALLENGER. Right. Well, I thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman OWENS. I want to thank all of the panelists that appeared today, as well as the panelists who appeared yesterday.

This concludes the 2-day hearing on H.R. 4014. If any of the panelists have further recommendations to make, we would welcome those recommendations within the next 10 days for the record.

Thank you again for appearing. The hearing of the subcommittee is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:53 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]